

The generalized Crewther relation and V-scheme: analytic $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s^4)$ results in QCD and QED

A. L. Kataev^{*1} and V. S. Molokoedov^{†1, 2, 3}

¹Institute for Nuclear Research of the Russian Academy of Science, 117312, Moscow, Russia

²Research Computing Center, Moscow State University, 119991, Moscow, Russia

³Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology, 141700, Dolgoprudny, Moscow Region, Russia

February 8, 2023

Abstract

Using the analytical $\overline{\text{MS}}$ -scheme three-loop contribution to the perturbative Coulomb-like part of the static color potential of heavy quark-antiquark system, we obtain the analytical expression for the fourth-order β -function in the gauge-invariant effective V-scheme in the case of the generic simple gauge group. Also we present the Adler function of electron-positron annihilation into hadrons and the coefficient function of the Bjorken polarized sum rule in the V-scheme up to α_s^4 terms. We demonstrate that at this level of PT in this effective scheme the β -function is factorized in the conformal symmetry breaking term of the generalized Crewther relation, which connects the flavor non-singlet contributions to the Adler and Bjorken polarized sum rule functions. We prove why this relation will be true in other gauge-invariant renormalization schemes as well. The obtained results enable to reveal the difference between the V-scheme β -function in QED and the Gell-Man–Low Ψ -function. This distinction arises due to the presence of the light-by-light type scattering corrections first appearing in the static potential at the three-loop level.

^{*}kataev@ms2.inr.ac.ru

[†]viktor.molokoedov@mail.ru

1 Introduction

As known the binding energy of quark-antiquark system in a color singlet state in QCD can be described by two terms, namely by the perturbative Coulomb-like contributions at short distances and substantially nonperturbative long-distance ones, modeling the confinement description. Investigation of this phenomenon is actively underway by means of the lattice calculations, where the linear dependence on distance r is predicted for nonperturbative part of the static potential (see e.g. [1–3] and references therein). In its turn, the non-abelian analogue of the Coulomb potential of QED is determined in the framework of the perturbation theory (PT) and, for instance, it is the main component upon studying spectroscopy of bound states like heavy quarkonia in the Non-Relativistic QCD [4, 5].

The static potential of interaction of the heavy quark-antiquark pair in general is defined via the vacuum expectation value of the gauge-invariant Wilson loop¹. The perturbative part of this potential is now available in analytic form in the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ renormalization scheme at the three-loop level. In the momentum representation its expression has the following form:

$$V(\vec{q}^2) = -\frac{4\pi C_F \alpha_s(\vec{q}^2)}{\vec{q}^2} \left[1 + a_1 a_s(\vec{q}^2) + a_2 a_s^2(\vec{q}^2) + \left(a_3 + \frac{\pi^2 C_A^3 L}{8} \right) a_s^3(\vec{q}^2) + \mathcal{O}(a_s^4) \right], \quad (1)$$

where α_s is the renormalized strong coupling constant in the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ -scheme, $a_s = \alpha_s/\pi$, $L = \log(\mu^2/\vec{q}^2)$, μ^2 is the scale $\overline{\text{MS}}$ -scheme parameter of the dimensional regularization, \vec{q}^2 is the square of the Euclidean three-dimensional momentum. The limit when time $T \rightarrow \infty$ formally leads to $q_0 \rightarrow 0$ and the square of the Euclidean four-dimensional transferred momentum $Q^2 \rightarrow \vec{q}^2$. Thus, technically we carry out the transition from the Euclidean four-dimensional space to its three-dimensional subspace. The renormalization group (RG) uncontrollable logarithmic term [4] arises in Eq.(1) due to the infrared (IR) divergences, which begin to manifest themselves in the static potential at the three-loop level. However, in the concrete applications of the effective non-relativistic QCD these IR-divergent terms are cancelling out with certain ultraviolet (UV) divergent terms originated by the interaction of ultrasoft gluons with the heavy quark-antiquark bound states (see e.g. [5, 6]). Since we consider regions of the intermediate and high energies only, these IR-corrections will not affect the behavior of various physical quantities and therefore we will not take them into account in our RG-oriented studies.

The analytical expression for the one-loop coefficient a_1 in Eq.(1) was calculated in Refs.[7, 8], while two-loop one a_2 is known from the calculations of Refs.[9, 10]. These terms read:

$$a_1 = \frac{31}{36} C_A - \frac{5}{9} T_F n_f, \quad (2)$$

$$a_2 = \left(\frac{4343}{2592} + \frac{\pi^2}{4} - \frac{\pi^4}{64} + \frac{11}{24} \zeta_3 \right) C_A^2 - \left(\frac{899}{648} + \frac{7}{6} \zeta_3 \right) C_A T_F n_f - \left(\frac{55}{48} - \zeta_3 \right) C_F T_F n_f + \left(\frac{5}{9} T_F n_f \right)^2. \quad (3)$$

Here n_f is the flavor number of active quarks and $\zeta_n = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} k^{-n}$ is the Riemann zeta-function.

¹More precisely through the limit of the logarithm of the path-ordering Wilson loop over a closed rectangular contour divided by the interaction time when this time tends to infinity.

The eigenvalues C_F and C_A of the quadratic Casimir operator in the fundamental and adjoint representation of the generic simple gauge group are defined as $(T^a T^a)_{ij} = C_F \delta_{ij}$ and $f^{acd} f^{bcd} = C_A \delta^{ab}$ correspondingly, where T^a are generators of the Lie algebra of the considered gauge group in the fundamental representation with the corresponding commutation relation $[T^a, T^b] = i f^{abc} T^c$. They are normalized as $\text{Tr}(T^a T^b) = T_F \delta^{ab}$ with the Dynkin index T_F . Note that in our study we are primarily interested in the case of the $SU(N_c)$ color group with $C_A = N_c$ and $C_F = (N_c^2 - 1)/(2N_c)$, $T_F = 1/2$, and its particular case of the $SU(3)$ -group, relevant for physical QCD.

The three-loop contribution a_3 is a cubic polynomial in n_f :

$$a_3 = a_3^{(3)} n_f^3 + a_3^{(2)} n_f^2 + a_3^{(1)} n_f + a_3^{(0)}. \quad (4)$$

The terms leading in powers of n_f can be extracted from the renormalon-chain contributions to the Coulomb QED static potential (or from the representation of the QED invariant charge directly related to the photon vacuum polarization function [11]). The analytical expression for the quadratic n_f^2 -coefficient was obtained in Ref.[12]. Because of the technical difficulties, the contributions $a_3^{(1)}$ and $a_3^{(0)}$ were calculated analytically later in Ref.[13]. They turned out to be much more complicated, than the coefficient $a_3^{(2)}$. Indeed, in addition to the expected appearance of π^2 , π^4 , ζ_3 , $\pi^2 \zeta_3$ and ζ_5 -terms (see e.g. [14]), the results of [13] also contain contributions proportional to $\pi^2 \log 2$, $\pi^4 \log 2$ and, more substantially, the basic constants with the new greatest weight of transcendence six $w = 6$, namely π^6 , ζ_3^2 , $\pi^2 \zeta_3 \log 2$, $\pi^4 \log^2 2$ and the ones that include more complicated functions, viz $\pi^2 \alpha_4$ and s_6 , where $\alpha_4 = \text{Li}_4(1/2) + \log^4 2/4!$ with polylogarithmic function $\text{Li}_n(x) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} x^k k^{-n}$ and $s_6 = \zeta_6 + \zeta_{-5,-1}$ with $\zeta_6 = \pi^6/945$ and multiple zeta value $\zeta_{-5,-1} = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} (-1)^{i+k} / i k^5$ (see Appendix A).

For the convenience of readers and for the purposes of the further discussion it is useful to present all four coefficients in flavor expansion (4):

$$a_3^{(3)} = -\left(\frac{5}{9}\right)^3 T_F^3, \quad (5a)$$

$$a_3^{(2)} = \left(\frac{12541}{15552} + \frac{23}{12} \zeta_3 + \frac{\pi^4}{135}\right) C_A T_F^2 + \left(\frac{7001}{2592} - \frac{13}{6} \zeta_3\right) C_F T_F^2, \quad (5b)$$

$$\begin{aligned} a_3^{(1)} = & \left[-\frac{58747}{31104} - \frac{89}{16} \zeta_3 + \frac{761}{161280} \pi^6 - \frac{3}{4} s_6 + \pi^4 \left(-\frac{157}{3456} - \frac{5}{576} \log 2 + \frac{\log^2 2}{64} \right) \right. \\ & + \pi^2 \left(\frac{17}{1728} - \frac{19}{192} \zeta_3 - \frac{\log 2}{48} - \frac{7}{32} \zeta_3 \log 2 - \frac{\alpha_4}{2} \right) + \frac{1091}{384} \zeta_5 + \frac{57}{128} \zeta_3^2 \Big] C_A^2 T_F \\ & + \left(-\frac{71281}{10368} + \frac{33}{8} \zeta_3 + \frac{5}{4} \zeta_5 \right) C_A C_F T_F + \left(\frac{143}{288} + \frac{37}{24} \zeta_3 - \frac{5}{2} \zeta_5 \right) C_F^2 T_F + \left[\frac{5}{96} \pi^6 \right. \\ & + \pi^4 \left(-\frac{23}{24} + \frac{\log 2}{6} - \frac{\log^2 2}{2} \right) + \pi^2 \left(\frac{79}{36} - \frac{61}{12} \zeta_3 + \log 2 + \frac{21}{2} \zeta_3 \log 2 \right) \Big] \frac{d_F^{abcd} d_F^{abcd}}{N_A}, \end{aligned} \quad (5c)$$

$$\begin{aligned} a_3^{(0)} = & \left[\frac{385645}{186624} + \frac{73}{24} \zeta_3 - \frac{4621}{193536} \pi^6 + \frac{9}{4} s_6 + \pi^4 \left(\frac{1349}{17280} - \frac{5}{144} \log 2 - \frac{5}{72} \log^2 2 \right) \right. \\ & + \pi^2 \left(-\frac{953}{3456} + \frac{175}{128} \zeta_3 - \frac{461}{288} \log 2 + \frac{217}{192} \zeta_3 \log 2 + \frac{73}{24} \alpha_4 \right) - \frac{1927}{384} \zeta_5 - \frac{143}{128} \zeta_3^2 \Big] C_A^3 \end{aligned} \quad (5d)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \left[\frac{1511}{2880} \pi^6 + \pi^4 \left(-\frac{39}{16} + \frac{35}{12} \log 2 + \frac{31}{12} \log^2 2 \right) + \pi^2 \left(\frac{929}{72} - \frac{827}{24} \zeta_3 - 74\alpha_4 \right. \right. \\
& \left. \left. + \frac{461}{6} \log 2 - \frac{217}{4} \zeta_3 \log 2 \right) \right] \frac{d_F^{abcd} d_A^{abcd}}{N_A}.
\end{aligned}$$

Here d_F^{abcd} and d_A^{abcd} are the rank four totally symmetric higher order group invariants, defined in the fundamental and adjoint representations; N_A is the number of generators of the group. For the particular case of the $SU(N_c)$ gauge group the aforementioned color structures are expressed through the number of colors N_c by the following way: $N_A = N_c^2 - 1$, $d_F^{abcd} d_A^{abcd} / N_A = N_c(N_c^2 + 6)/48$, $d_F^{abcd} d_F^{abcd} / N_A = (N_c^4 - 6N_c^2 + 18)/(96N_c^2)$.

Our further analysis will be in part a continuation of the work [15], where we investigated the requirements imposed on renormalization schemes leading to the factorization of the conformal anomaly term $\beta(a_s)/a_s$ in the generalized Crewther relation

$$D^{NS}(a_s) C_{Bjp}^{NS}(a_s) = 1 + \Delta_{csb}(a_s) = 1 + \left(\frac{\beta(a_s)}{a_s} \right) K(a_s), \quad (6)$$

which involves two RG-invariant Euclidean quantities, namely the flavor non-singlet (NS) contributions to the Adler function $D(Q^2)$ and to the coefficient function $C_{Bjp}(Q^2)$ of the Bjorken polarized sum rule. The first of them is the characteristics of the e^+e^- annihilation into hadrons, whereas the second one enters in theoretical expression for the Bjorken sum rule for deep inelastic scattering (DIS) of the polarized charged leptons on nucleons. Note that $a_s = a_s(\mu^2 = Q^2)$ in Eq.(6).

In the normalization used by us, the unity in Eq.(6) corresponds to the original Crewther relation [16], derived in the Born approximation of the massless theory of strong interactions by means of application of the operator product expansion (OPE) approach to the axial-vector-vector (AVV) triangle diagram in the conformal symmetry limit.

It was discovered in Ref.[17] that in the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ -scheme starting from a_s^2 -terms of PT the Crewther relation is modified. In addition to unity, an extra contribution arises that turns out to be proportional to the RG β -function:

$$\mu^2 \frac{\partial a_s(\mu^2)}{\partial \mu^2} = \beta(a_s(\mu^2)) = - \sum_{i \geq 0} \beta_i a_s^{i+2}(\mu^2). \quad (7)$$

The renormalization procedure breaks the conformal symmetry of the massless QCD. In particular, this reflects the violation of the symmetry with respect to conformal transformations of the AVV function. The effect of this violation in Eq.(6) is described by the conformal symmetry breaking term $\Delta_{csb}(a_s)$, proportional to the factor $\beta(a_s)/a_s$ and containing the polynomial $K(a_s) = \sum_{n \geq 1} K_n a_s^n$ in powers of a_s . This fact was discovered in the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ -scheme at the $\mathcal{O}(a_s^3)$ level in [17] and confirmed at the $\mathcal{O}(a_s^4)$ level later in [18]. Now it is customary to call this form of the generalized Crewther relation as the Crewther–Broadhurst–Kataev (CBK) relation in the literature. It was intensively studied from different points of view e.g. in works [19–22].

Recently the analog of the CBK relation was considered in the extended QCD model with arbitrary number of fermion representations at $\mathcal{O}(a_s^4)$ level in Ref.[23]. It was shown there that in this case the CBK relation remains valid as well. This fact confirms the non-accidental nature of factorization of β -function at least at $\mathcal{O}(a_s^4)$ order. Moreover, arguments presented in Refs.[24–26] indicate that the CBK relation will be true in the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ -scheme in QCD in all orders of PT.

The natural question arises whether there do exist theoretical requirements on the choice of the ultraviolet subtraction schemes, which provide the realization of the fundamental property of the β -factorization in the CBK relation. The results of [15, 27, 28] demonstrate that this feature of CBK will be implemented for a wide class of gauge-dependent momentum subtraction MOM-like schemes (such as, for instance, the mMOM-scheme [29–34]) in a linear covariant Landau gauge $\xi = 0^2$ at least at the $\mathcal{O}(a_s^4)$ level (and apparently in all orders of PT). Therefore, the often prevailing opinion in the literature that the CBK-relation is valid only for the gauge-invariant MS-like schemes turned out to be incorrect.

Since it is not obvious that the factorization of the RG β -function in the CBK relation will also be observed in some gauge-invariant schemes other than MS-like ones, in this work we will study this issue on the example of the effective gauge-independent V-scheme. In this scheme the static potential of heavy quark-antiquark pair has the Coulomb-like form and all higher order corrections are absorbed in redefinition of the effective charge with a corresponding change in the scale parameter. For this aim and for the goals that will be discussed later, we will obtain the analytical expressions for β -function in the V-scheme in the four-loop approximation and also for both the Adler and the coefficient function of the Bjorken polarized sum rule in the V-scheme in the same order of PT in the case of generic simple gauge group. Thereby, we will perform the logical completion of the studies started in [14] and continued later in [15]. Further we will generalize the consideration of the factorization of β -function in the CBK relation to a wide class of gauge-invariant subtraction schemes. Similar problems will also be investigated for the case of the QED. In the end, we will draw a number of conclusions on the relationship between β -function in the V-scheme in QED and the Gell-Man–Low Ψ -function, including a fixation of definite four-loop contributions to the static potential directly obtained in [35].

2 β -function in the V-scheme

Let us turn to the effective gauge-invariant V-scheme. It was first introduced in Refs.[9, 10] and was used in modeling the smooth transition of the QCD coupling constant through the thresholds of heavy quark productions in the case when the mass corrections to the static potential are taken into account [36]. Other applications of the V-scheme in the perturbative QCD studies may be found e.g. in Refs.[2, 37–41]).

Now we use the analytical results on the static potential presented in previous section to refine the semi-analytic form of the fourth-order expression for the RG β^V -function in the generic simple gauge group, obtained previously in [14] and applied to analysis of theoretical QCD ambiguities for e^+e^- annihilation into hadrons R -ratio at the $\mathcal{O}(a_s^4)$ -level in an energy region below manifestation of the left shoulder of Z^0 -peak.

Summarizing the aforesaid, one can succinctly describe the V-scheme by the following expression of the static heavy quark-antiquark potential in the Coulomb-like form:

$$V(\vec{q}^2) = -4\pi C_F \frac{\alpha_{s,V}(\vec{q}^2)}{\vec{q}^2}, \quad (8)$$

where all higher order PT corrections to $V(\vec{q}^2)$ are absorbed in the effective coupling $\alpha_{s,V}(\vec{q}^2)$ and, as was already stated, we neglect the contribution of the three-loop IR logarithmic term in Eq.(1).

²The gauges $\xi = -3$ and $\xi = -1$ are the highlighted ones as well (for more detail see [15, 27, 28]).

In accordance with technique of the effective charges (ECH), developed in Refs.[42–44], we define the effective V-scheme scale by means of the following relation, associated with its $\overline{\text{MS}}$ -scheme counterpart:

$$\mu_V^2 = \mu^2 \exp(a_1/\beta_0), \quad (9)$$

where a_1 is given by Eq.(2) and β_0 is the first scheme-independent coefficient [45, 46] of the RG β -function (7). Further, fixing $\bar{q}^2 = \mu_V^2$ one can finally gain the link between couplings in the V- and $\overline{\text{MS}}$ -scheme, normalized at one V-scheme scale:

$$\alpha_{s,V}(\mu_V^2) = \alpha_s(\mu_V^2) \left(1 + a_1 a_s(\mu_V^2) + a_2 a_s^2(\mu_V^2) + a_3 a_s^3(\mu_V^2) + \mathcal{O}(a_s^4) \right). \quad (10)$$

After that we define β -function in the V-scheme that governs the scale dependence of $\alpha_{s,V}$

$$\beta^V(a_{s,V}) = \mu_V^2 \frac{\partial a_{s,V}}{\partial \mu_V^2} = - \sum_{i \geq 0} \beta_i^V a_{s,V}^{i+2} \quad (11)$$

and its relation to the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ -scheme β -function:

$$\beta^V(a_{s,V}(a_s)) = \beta(a_s) \frac{\partial a_{s,V}(a_s)}{\partial a_s} \quad (12)$$

The combination of the Eqs.(10) and (12) yields the following relationships between coefficients of β -functions in the V- and $\overline{\text{MS}}$ -scheme:

$$\beta_0^V = \beta_0, \quad \beta_1^V = \beta_1, \quad (13a)$$

$$\beta_2^V = \beta_2 - a_1 \beta_1 + (a_2 - a_1^2) \beta_0, \quad (13b)$$

$$\beta_3^V = \beta_3 - 2a_1 \beta_2 + a_1^2 \beta_1 + (2a_3 - 6a_1 a_2 + 4a_1^3) \beta_0, \quad (13c)$$

and even in higher orders of PT with still unknown correction a_4 to the static potential

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_4^V &= \beta_4 - 3a_1 \beta_3 + (4a_1^2 - a_2) \beta_2 + (a_3 - 2a_1 a_2) \beta_1 \\ &+ (3a_4 - 12a_1 a_3 - 5a_2^2 + 28a_1^2 a_2 - 14a_1^4) \beta_0, \end{aligned} \quad (13d)$$

etc. These formulas reflect the transformation laws of the coefficients of the β -functions upon transition from one gauge-invariant renormalization scheme to another one. The consequence of application of the ECH approach is a scheme-invariance of all coefficients of the effective β -functions within the gauge-independent MS-like schemes (for details see [47, 48]).

The first two coefficients of β^V coincide identically with their $\overline{\text{MS}}$ -analogs (13a), calculated in [45, 46], [49–51] correspondingly:

$$\beta_0^V = \frac{11}{12} C_A - \frac{1}{3} T_F n_f, \quad (14a)$$

$$\beta_1^V = \frac{17}{24} C_A^2 - \frac{5}{12} C_A T_F n_f - \frac{1}{4} C_F T_F n_f. \quad (14b)$$

The third and fourth terms β_2^V and β_3^V (13b-13c) are expressed through three- and four-loop coefficients of the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ -scheme RG β -function, analytically computed in Refs.[52, 53] and [54, 55]

respectively. Using Eqs.(2-3) and (13b), one can obtain the analytic three-loop coefficient β_2^V :

$$\begin{aligned}\beta_2^V &= \left(\frac{103}{96} + \frac{121}{288}\zeta_3 + \frac{11}{48}\pi^2 - \frac{11}{768}\pi^4 \right) C_A^3 \\ &+ \left(-\frac{445}{576} - \frac{11}{9}\zeta_3 - \frac{\pi^2}{12} + \frac{\pi^4}{192} \right) C_A^2 T_F n_f + \left(-\frac{343}{288} + \frac{11}{12}\zeta_3 \right) C_A C_F T_F n_f \\ &+ \frac{1}{32} C_F^2 T_F n_f + \left(\frac{1}{288} + \frac{7}{18}\zeta_3 \right) C_A T_F^2 n_f^2 + \left(\frac{23}{72} - \frac{1}{3}\zeta_3 \right) C_F T_F^2 n_f^2 .\end{aligned}\quad (14c)$$

This result was originally derived in Ref.[10]. Unlike the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ -scheme β_2 -term, the coefficient β_2^V contains not only the rational numbers but the transcendental ones as well, namely the ζ_3 , π^2 and π^4 -contributions. They originate from two-loop correction a_2 (3) to the static potential.

Utilizing now Eqs.(5a-5d) and (13c), we find the four-loop coefficient β_3^V in analytical form:

$$\begin{aligned}\beta_3^V &= \left[-\frac{3871}{2592} + \frac{1463}{432}\zeta_3 - \frac{21197}{2304}\zeta_5 - \frac{1573}{768}\zeta_3^2 + \frac{33}{8}s_6 - \frac{50831}{1161216}\pi^6 \right. \\ &+ \pi^4 \left(\frac{45023}{207360} - \frac{55}{864}\log 2 - \frac{55}{432}\log^2 2 \right) + \pi^2 \left(-\frac{35035}{20736} + \frac{1925}{768}\zeta_3 + \frac{803}{144}\alpha_4 - \frac{5071}{1728}\log 2 \right. \\ &+ \left. \left. \frac{2387}{1152}\zeta_3 \log 2 \right) \right] C_A^4 + \left[\frac{731}{192} - \frac{13}{3}\zeta_3 + \frac{19709}{2304}\zeta_5 + \frac{1199}{768}\zeta_3^2 - \frac{23}{8}s_6 + \frac{10189}{414720}\pi^6 \right. \\ &+ \pi^4 \left(-\frac{2419}{11520} + \frac{25}{3456}\log 2 + \frac{259}{3456}\log^2 2 \right) + \pi^2 \left(\frac{14477}{10368} - \frac{1259}{1152}\zeta_3 - \frac{53}{18}\alpha_4 + \frac{889}{864}\log 2 \right. \\ &- \left. \left. \frac{665}{576}\zeta_3 \log 2 \right) \right] C_A^3 T_F n_f + \left[-\frac{7645}{1152} + \frac{61}{24}\zeta_3 + \frac{55}{24}\zeta_5 \right] C_A^2 C_F T_F n_f + \frac{23}{128} C_F^3 T_F n_f \\ &+ \left[\frac{143}{576} + \frac{143}{48}\zeta_3 - \frac{55}{12}\zeta_5 \right] C_A C_F^2 T_F n_f + \left[-\frac{1171}{432} + \frac{89}{72}\zeta_3 - \frac{1091}{576}\zeta_5 - \frac{19}{64}\zeta_3^2 + \frac{1}{2}s_6 \right. \\ &- \left. \frac{761}{241920}\pi^6 + \pi^4 \left(\frac{529}{8640} + \frac{5}{864}\log 2 - \frac{1}{96}\log^2 2 \right) + \pi^2 \left(-\frac{737}{2592} + \frac{19}{288}\zeta_3 + \frac{1}{3}\alpha_4 \right. \right. \\ &+ \left. \left. \frac{1}{72}\log 2 + \frac{7}{48}\zeta_3 \log 2 \right) \right] C_A^2 T_F^2 n_f^2 + \left[\frac{583}{144} - \frac{7}{4}\zeta_3 - \frac{5}{6}\zeta_5 \right] C_A C_F T_F^2 n_f^2 + \left[-\frac{29}{288} - \frac{4}{3}\zeta_3 \right. \\ &+ \left. \frac{5}{3}\zeta_5 \right] C_F^2 T_F^2 n_f^2 + \left[\frac{293}{648} + \frac{\zeta_3}{54} - \frac{2}{405}\pi^4 \right] C_A T_F^3 n_f^3 + \left[-\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\zeta_3}{3} \right] C_F T_F^3 n_f^3 + \left[-\frac{5}{144} \right. \\ &+ \left. \frac{11}{12}\zeta_3 \right] \frac{d_A^{abcd} d_A^{abcd}}{N_A} + \left[\frac{2}{9} - \frac{13}{6}\zeta_3 \right] \frac{d_F^{abcd} d_A^{abcd}}{N_A} n_f + \left[-\frac{1511}{4320}\pi^6 + \pi^4 \left(\frac{13}{8} - \frac{35}{18}\log 2 \right. \right. \\ &- \left. \left. \frac{31}{18}\log^2 2 \right) + \pi^2 \left(-\frac{929}{108} + \frac{827}{36}\zeta_3 + \frac{148}{3}\alpha_4 - \frac{461}{9}\log 2 + \frac{217}{6}\zeta_3 \log 2 \right) \right] \frac{d_F^{abcd} d_A^{abcd}}{N_A} T_F n_f \\ &+ \left[\frac{16621}{17280}\pi^6 + \pi^4 \left(-\frac{143}{32} + \frac{385}{72}\log 2 + \frac{341}{72}\log^2 2 \right) + \pi^2 \left(\frac{10219}{432} - \frac{9097}{144}\zeta_3 - \frac{407}{3}\alpha_4 \right. \right. \\ &+ \left. \left. \frac{5071}{36}\log 2 - \frac{2387}{24}\zeta_3 \log 2 \right) \right] C_A \frac{d_F^{abcd} d_A^{abcd}}{N_A} + \left[\frac{55}{576}\pi^6 - \pi^4 \left(\frac{253}{144} - \frac{11}{36}\log 2 + \frac{11}{12}\log^2 2 \right) \right]\end{aligned}\quad (14d)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \pi^2 \left(\frac{869}{216} - \frac{671}{72} \zeta_3 + \frac{11}{6} \log 2 + \frac{77}{4} \zeta_3 \log 2 \right) \left[C_A \frac{d_F^{abcd} d_F^{abcd}}{N_A} n_f - \left[\frac{11}{36} - \frac{2}{3} \zeta_3 \right] \frac{d_F^{abcd} d_F^{abcd}}{N_A} n_f^2 \right. \\
& + \left[-\frac{5}{144} \pi^6 + \pi^4 \left(\frac{23}{36} - \frac{1}{9} \log 2 + \frac{1}{3} \log^2 2 \right) + \pi^2 \left(-\frac{79}{54} + \frac{61}{18} \zeta_3 - \frac{2}{3} \log 2 \right. \right. \\
& \left. \left. - 7 \zeta_3 \log 2 \right) \right] \frac{d_F^{abcd} d_F^{abcd}}{N_A} T_F n_f^2.
\end{aligned}$$

The analytical result (14d) improves the presentation of our previous semi-analytic expression for β_3^V , obtained in [14]. Indeed, the coefficient β_3^V presented there contained numerical uncertainties, associated with the inability to calculate specific three-loop master integrals to the static potential with high precision [12, 56, 57] sufficient to apply the PSLQ algorithm [58, 59] and restore their analytical expressions from the obtained numerical values. This problem was solved in Ref.[13] by means of the dimensional recurrence relation [60] and the convergence acceleration algorithm [61].

The expression (14d) is rather cumbersome: unlike β_3 -coefficient in the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ -scheme, which contains rational numbers and ζ_3 -contributions only, the coefficient β_3^V is expressed through a much larger number of terms with higher transcendentalities initially appearing in the three-loop correction a_3 to the static potential. Note also that the result (14d) includes four extra color structures originating from $2a_3\beta_0$ -term in Eq.(13c) and not encountered in the representation of β_3 -coefficient, viz $C_A d_F^{abcd} d_A^{abcd}/N_A$, $C_A d_F^{abcd} d_F^{abcd} n_f/N_A$, $d_F^{abcd} d_A^{abcd} T_F n_f/N_A$ and $d_F^{abcd} d_F^{abcd} T_F n_f^2/N_A$ patterns. The term proportional to the $d_A^{abcd} d_A^{abcd}/N_A$ -structure in (14d) follows from the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ -scheme coefficient β_3 . For the particular case of the $SU(N_c)$ gauge group, the discussed term is equal to $d_A^{abcd} d_A^{abcd}/N_A = N_c^2(N_c^2 + 36)/24$.

Taking into account the values $\alpha_4 \approx 0.5270972$, $s_6 \approx 0.9874414$, we arrive to the following numerical form of Eqs.(14a-14d) in the case of the $SU(3)$ color gauge group:

$$\beta_0^V = 2.75 - 0.1666667 n_f, \quad (15a)$$

$$\beta_1^V = 6.375 - 0.7916667 n_f, \quad (15b)$$

$$\beta_2^V = 66.00284 - 11.656347 n_f + 0.3261237 n_f^2, \quad (15c)$$

$$\beta_3^V = 168.6484 - 50.59222 n_f + 2.761578 n_f^2 - 0.0190318 n_f^3. \quad (15d)$$

The expressions (15c-15d) should be compared with their $\overline{\text{MS}}$ counterparts [52, 53], [54, 55]

$$\beta_2 = 22.32031 - 4.368924 n_f + 0.0940394 n_f^2, \quad (16a)$$

$$\beta_3 = 114.2303 - 27.13394 n_f + 1.582379 n_f^2 + 0.0058567 n_f^3, \quad (16b)$$

and with the mMOM ones in the Landau gauge [29, 30, 32]

$$\beta_2^{\text{mMOM}, \xi=0} = 47.50754 - 9.771667 n_f + 0.3028642 n_f^2, \quad (17a)$$

$$\beta_3^{\text{mMOM}, \xi=0} = 392.7385 - 95.40363 n_f + 6.349228 n_f^2 - 0.1073931 n_f^3. \quad (17b)$$

Naturally, the first two coefficients of the RG β -function in the V-, $\overline{\text{MS}}$ - and mMOM-scheme in the Landau gauge coincide respectively.

3 The Adler function, R -ratio and the Bjorken polarized sum rule in the V-scheme

3.1 The Adler function in the V-scheme

As known, the Adler function $D(Q^2)$ is the convenient ingredient for calculating the Minkowskian annihilation electron-positron cross section into hadrons with help of the Källen–Lehmann-type dispersion relation (see e.g. [62, 63]). It is determined in the Euclidean domain with the Euclidean transferred momentum $Q^2 = -q^2$ and, what is very substantial, is a renorm-invariant quantity. Its two-, three- and four-loop expressions in the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ -scheme were directly evaluated in Refs.[64–66], [67, 68] and [18, 69, 70] respectively.

In the massless limit the Adler function is decomposed into a sum of the flavor non-singlet (NS) and singlet (SI) components:

$$D(a_s) = d_R \left(\sum_f Q_f^2 \right) D^{NS}(a_s) + d_R \left(\sum_f Q_f \right)^2 D^{SI}(a_s), \quad (18)$$

where d_R is the dimension of the quark representation of the Lie algebra of the considered generic simple gauge group. In the case of the $SU(N_c)$ color gauge group $d_R = N_c$. Q_f is the electric charge of the active quark with flavor f . The singlet (SI) flavor contribution $D^{SI}(a_s)$ appears from the third order of PT due to the special diagrams of the light-by-light scattering type [67, 70].

In order to obtain the analytic four-loop expression for the NS Adler function $D_V^{NS}(a_{s,V})$ in the V-scheme, we use its explicit $\overline{\text{MS}}$ -scheme result at the $\mathcal{O}(a_s^4)$ level, the relation (10) between the corresponding couplings in two considered gauge-independent schemes and take into account that the flavor NS Adler function is the RG-invariant quantity. Keeping in mind the aforesaid, we get the following results:

$$D_V^{NS}(a_{s,V}) = 1 + \sum_{k \geq 1} d_{k,V}^{NS} a_{s,V}^k, \quad (19a)$$

$$d_{1,V}^{NS} = \frac{3}{4} C_F, \quad (19b)$$

$$d_{2,V}^{NS} = -\frac{3}{32} C_F^2 + \left(\frac{307}{96} - \frac{11}{4} \zeta_3 \right) C_F C_A + \left(-\frac{23}{24} + \zeta_3 \right) C_F T_F n_f, \quad (19c)$$

$$d_{3,V}^{NS} = -\frac{69}{128} C_F^3 + \left(-\frac{175}{96} - \frac{143}{16} \zeta_3 + \frac{55}{4} \zeta_5 \right) C_F^2 C_A \quad (19d)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & + \left(\frac{621}{32} - \frac{1403}{96} \zeta_3 - \frac{55}{24} \zeta_5 - \frac{3}{16} \pi^2 + \frac{3}{256} \pi^4 \right) C_F C_A^2 + \left(\frac{3}{2} - \zeta_3 \right) C_F T_F^2 n_f^2 \\ & + \left(-\frac{375}{32} + \frac{205}{24} \zeta_3 + \frac{5}{6} \zeta_5 \right) C_F C_A T_F n_f + \left(\frac{29}{96} + 4\zeta_3 - 5\zeta_5 \right) C_F^2 T_F n_f, \\ d_{4,V}^{NS} & = \left(\frac{4157}{2048} + \frac{3}{8} \zeta_3 \right) C_F^4 + \left(-\frac{3335}{512} - \frac{139}{128} \zeta_3 + \frac{2255}{32} \zeta_5 - \frac{1155}{16} \zeta_7 \right) C_F^3 C_A \\ & + \left(-\frac{498269}{18432} - \frac{17513}{192} \zeta_3 + 100\zeta_5 + \frac{1155}{32} \zeta_7 + \frac{3}{64} \pi^2 - \frac{3}{1024} \pi^4 \right) C_F^2 C_A^2 \end{aligned} \quad (19e)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \left[\frac{668335}{4608} - \frac{101621}{1152} \zeta_3 - \frac{89119}{1536} \zeta_5 + \frac{34199}{1536} \zeta_3^2 - \frac{385}{64} \zeta_7 - \frac{27}{16} s_6 + \frac{4621}{258048} \pi^6 \right. \\
& + \pi^4 \left(\frac{1}{90} - \frac{11}{128} \zeta_3 + \frac{5}{192} \log 2 + \frac{5}{96} \log^2 2 \right) + \pi^2 \left(-\frac{4183}{4608} + \frac{179}{512} \zeta_3 - \frac{73}{32} \alpha_4 \right. \\
& + \left. \frac{461}{384} \log 2 - \frac{217}{256} \zeta_3 \log 2 \right) \left. \right] C_F C_A^3 + \left(\frac{287}{256} + \frac{17}{8} \zeta_3 - \frac{235}{8} \zeta_5 + \frac{105}{4} \zeta_7 \right) C_F^3 T_F n_f \\
& + \left(\frac{12277}{1152} + \frac{1117}{16} \zeta_3 - \frac{145}{2} \zeta_5 - \frac{11}{4} \zeta_3^2 - \frac{105}{8} \zeta_7 \right) C_F^2 C_A T_F n_f \\
& + \left[-\frac{201725}{1536} + \frac{41071}{576} \zeta_3 + \frac{87847}{1536} \zeta_5 - \frac{20225}{1536} \zeta_3^2 + \frac{35}{16} \zeta_7 + \frac{9}{16} s_6 - \frac{761}{215040} \pi^6 \right. \\
& + \pi^4 \left(\frac{109}{4608} + \frac{\zeta_3}{32} + \frac{5}{768} \log 2 - \frac{3}{256} \log^2 2 \right) + \pi^2 \left(\frac{367}{2304} - \frac{109}{256} \zeta_3 + \frac{3}{8} \alpha_4 + \frac{\log 2}{64} \right. \\
& + \left. \frac{21}{128} \zeta_3 \log 2 \right) \left. \right] C_F C_A^2 T_F n_f + \left(-\frac{125}{384} - \frac{281}{24} \zeta_3 + \frac{25}{2} \zeta_5 + \zeta_3^2 \right) C_F^2 T_F^2 n_f^2 \\
& + \left(\frac{81103}{2304} - \frac{4859}{288} \zeta_3 - \frac{35}{2} \zeta_5 + \frac{11}{6} \zeta_3^2 - \frac{\pi^4}{180} \right) C_F C_A T_F^2 n_f^2 - \left(\frac{67}{24} - \frac{7}{6} \zeta_3 - \frac{5}{3} \zeta_5 \right) C_F T_F^3 n_f^3 \\
& + \left(\frac{3}{16} - \frac{\zeta_3}{4} - \frac{5}{4} \zeta_5 \right) \frac{d_F^{abcd} d_A^{abcd}}{d_R} + \left(-\frac{13}{16} - \zeta_3 + \frac{5}{2} \zeta_5 \right) \frac{d_F^{abcd} d_F^{abcd}}{d_R} n_f \\
& + \left[-\frac{1511}{3840} \pi^6 + \pi^4 \left(\frac{117}{64} - \frac{35}{16} \log 2 - \frac{31}{16} \log^2 2 \right) + \pi^2 \left(-\frac{929}{96} + \frac{827}{32} \zeta_3 + \frac{111}{2} \alpha_4 \right. \right. \\
& - \left. \frac{461}{8} \log 2 + \frac{651}{16} \zeta_3 \log 2 \right) \left. \right] C_F \frac{d_F^{abcd} d_A^{abcd}}{N_A} + \left[-\frac{5}{128} \pi^6 + \pi^4 \left(\frac{23}{32} - \frac{\log 2}{8} + \frac{3}{8} \log^2 2 \right) \right. \\
& + \left. \pi^2 \left(-\frac{79}{48} + \frac{61}{16} \zeta_3 - \frac{3}{4} \log 2 - \frac{63}{8} \zeta_3 \log 2 \right) \right] C_F \frac{d_F^{abcd} d_F^{abcd}}{N_A} n_f.
\end{aligned}$$

Let us make a few comments on the derived expressions. First of all, unlike $\overline{\text{MS}}$ -scheme three-loop results, the coefficient $d_{3,V}^{NS}$ (19d) contains the complementary terms into $C_F C_A^2$ -contribution, which are proportional to π^2 and π^4 . Secondly, the coefficient $d_{4,V}^{NS}$ (19e) includes all transcendental basic constants, comprised in β_3^V , plus the extra ζ_7 -term with the greatest transcendence of weight $w = 7$, originally appearing from d_4 in the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ -scheme [69]. It is also worth noting that in contrast to d_4 , the analytic expression for $d_{4,V}^{NS}$ has two additional color structures, namely $C_F d_F^{abcd} d_A^{abcd}/N_A$ and $C_F d_F^{abcd} d_F^{abcd} n_f/N_A$, coming from the product of a_3 on d_1 .

For the $SU(3)$ case the numerical form of these coefficients read:

$$d_{1,V}^{NS} = 1, \quad (20a)$$

$$d_{2,V}^{NS} = -0.597626 + 0.1624824 n_f, \quad (20b)$$

$$d_{3,V}^{NS} = -7.21638 - 1.240217 n_f + 0.0993144 n_f^2, \quad (20c)$$

$$d_{4,V}^{NS} = 19.9437 + 4.38696 n_f - 1.114839 n_f^2 + 0.0564909 n_f^3. \quad (20d)$$

The SI contributions to the coefficients d_3 and d_4 of the Adler function were calculated in the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ -scheme in Refs.[67, 70] correspondingly. Taking into account the renormalization invariance of

the function $D(Q^2)$, one can obtain the SI contributions to the coefficients $d_{3,V}$ and $d_{4,V}$:

$$D_V^{SI}(a_{s,V}) = \sum_{k \geq 3} d_{k,V}^{SI} a_{s,V}^k, \quad (21a)$$

$$d_{3,V}^{SI} = d_3^{SI} = \left(\frac{11}{192} - \frac{\zeta_3}{8} \right) \frac{d^{abc} d^{abc}}{d_R}, \quad (21b)$$

$$d_{4,V}^{SI} = d_4^{SI} - 3a_1 d_3^{SI} = \left[\left(-\frac{13}{64} - \frac{\zeta_3}{4} + \frac{5}{8} \zeta_5 \right) C_F + \left(\frac{3211}{4608} - \frac{383}{384} \zeta_3 \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. + \frac{45}{64} \zeta_5 - \frac{11}{32} \zeta_3^2 \right) C_A + \left(-\frac{47}{288} + \frac{19}{96} \zeta_3 - \frac{5}{16} \zeta_5 + \frac{\zeta_3^2}{8} \right) T_F n_f \right] \frac{d^{abc} d^{abc}}{d_R}, \quad (21c)$$

where d^{abc} is the symmetric color constant, which for the case of the $SU(N_c)$ -group, we are interested in, obeys the relation $d^{abc} d^{abc} = (N_c^2 - 4)(N_c^2 - 1)/N_c$.

The expressions (21b) and (21c) in the numerical form are:

$$d_{3,V}^{SI} = -0.413179, \quad d_{4,V}^{SI} = -2.74010 - 0.152688 n_f. \quad (22)$$

3.2 The $R(s)$ -ratio in the V-scheme

Let us move on to the case of $R(s)$ -ratio of process of the electron-positron annihilation into hadrons. This quantity is directly measured in the Minkowski region of energies and is expressed through the cross section of this process:

$$R(s) = \frac{\sigma(e^+ e^- \rightarrow \gamma^* \rightarrow \text{hadrons})}{\sigma_{Born}(e^+ e^- \rightarrow \gamma^* \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-)} = d_R \left(\sum_f Q_f^2 \right) R^{NS}(a_s) + d_R \left(\sum_f Q_f \right)^2 R^{SI}(a_s), \quad (23)$$

where $\sigma_{Born}(e^+ e^- \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-) = 4\pi\alpha_{EM}^2/3s$ is the Born massless normalization factor.

The Källén–Lehmann-type dispersion representation (see e.g. [62, 63]), related the Adler function to $R(s)$ -ratio, dictates the following analytic correspondence:

$$R(s) = D(s) - \frac{\pi^2}{3} d_1 \beta_0^2 a_s^3 - \pi^2 \left(d_2 \beta_0^2 + \frac{5}{6} d_1 \beta_1 \beta_0 \right) a_s^4 + \mathcal{O}(a_s^5). \quad (24)$$

The terms proportional to π^2 appear here as an effect of the analytic continuation from the Euclidean to Minkowskian domain.

Using Eq.(24) and reckoning for the RG invariance of the R -ratio, one can conclude that there are valid the following relations between the coefficients of the NS and SI contributions to the R -ratio and the Adler function in the V-scheme:

$$R_V^{NS}(a_{s,V}) = 1 + \sum_{k \geq 1} r_{k,V}^{NS} a_{s,V}^k, \quad R_V^{SI}(a_{s,V}) = \sum_{k \geq 3} r_{k,V}^{SI} a_{s,V}^k, \quad (25a)$$

$$r_{1,V}^{NS} = d_{1,V}^{NS}, \quad r_{2,V}^{NS} = d_{2,V}^{NS}, \quad (25b)$$

$$r_{3,V}^{NS} = d_{3,V}^{NS} - \frac{\pi^2}{3} d_1 \beta_0^2, \quad r_{3,V}^{SI} = d_{3,V}^{SI}, \quad (25c)$$

$$r_{4,V}^{NS} = d_{4,V}^{NS} - \pi^2 \left(d_{2,V}^{NS} \beta_0^2 + \frac{5}{6} d_1 \beta_1 \beta_0 \right), \quad r_{4,V}^{SI} = d_{4,V}^{SI}. \quad (25d)$$

Taking into account Eqs.(25b-25d), we arrive at the complete numerical result for $R_V(s)$ in the V-scheme for physically relevant case of $SU(3)$ group:

$$R_V(a_{s,V}) = 3 \sum_f Q_f^2 \left(1 + \sum_{k \geq 1} r_{k,V} a_{s,V}^k \right), \quad (26a)$$

$$r_{1,V} = 1, \quad (26b)$$

$$r_{2,V} = -0.597626 + 0.1624824n_f, \quad (26c)$$

$$r_{3,V} = -32.09600 + 1.775495n_f + 0.0079291n_f^2 - 0.413179\delta_f, \quad (26d)$$

$$r_{4,V} = -79.6389 + 13.49715n_f - 0.566196n_f^2 + 0.0119455n_f^3 + (-2.74010 - 0.152688n_f)\delta_f, \quad (26e)$$

where terms with $\delta_f = (\sum_f Q_f)^2 / (\sum_f Q_f^2)$ are the SI-contributions. Note that the analogous V-scheme numerical expressions for R -ratio coefficients were presented previously in Ref.[14] but with corresponding theoretical mean square uncertainties ensuing from the inaccuracies of the calculation of a_3 -term to the static potential [12, 56, 57]. Naturally, these results are in full agreement with those given in (26b-26e). The discussed uncertainties are negligible and much smaller than the ones related with the determination of physical parameters such as $\alpha_s(M_Z^2)$ [71]. The interested reader may find outcomes of the study of the scheme- and scale-dependence of the $R(s)$ -ratio at the NLO, NNLO and N³LO approximations in cases when $n_f = 4$ and $n_f = 5$ in Refs.[14, 28, 31].

3.3 The Bjorken polarized sum rule in the V-scheme

One of the important physical quantities upon investigation of the DIS process of the polarized leptons on nucleons is the coefficient Bjorken function $C_{Bjp}(Q^2)$, defining the magnitude of scaling violation in QCD. It is determined in the Euclidean region of energies and included in the Bjorken polarized sum rule (neglecting the $\mathcal{O}(1/Q^{2k})$ nonperturbative terms):

$$\int_0^1 \left(g_1^{lp}(x, Q^2) - g_1^{ln}(x, Q^2) \right) dx = \frac{1}{6} \left| \frac{g_A}{g_V} \right| C_{Bjp}(Q^2). \quad (27)$$

Here $g_1^{lp}(x, Q^2)$ and $g_1^{ln}(x, Q^2)$ are the structure functions of the DIS processes, which characterize the spin distribution of quarks and gluons inside nucleons, g_A and g_V are the axial and vector neutron β -decay constants with $g_A/g_V = -1.2754 \pm 0.0013$ [71].

The coefficient Bjorken function is separated in two components, namely in the NS and SI ones:

$$C_{Bjp}(a_s) = C_{Bjp}^{NS}(a_s) + d_R \sum_f Q_f C_{Bjp}^{SI}(a_s). \quad (28)$$

The one-, two-, three- and four-loop results for the NS coefficient Bjorken function in the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ -scheme were obtained in Refs.[72], [73], [74], [18] correspondingly. Unlike $D^{SI}(a_s)$ -function, the SI part to $C_{Bjp}(a_s)$ appears first at the $\mathcal{O}(a_s^4)$ level [75] and was calculated analytically in Ref.[76].

Using the explicit fourth-order approximation for the Bjorken function in the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ -scheme [18, 76], the relation (10) and bearing in mind the RG-invariance of the $C_{Bjp}(a_s)$, we gain the following

expressions for the NS and SI-contributions to the coefficient Bjorken function in the V-scheme:

$$C_{Bjp,V}^{NS}(a_{s,V}) = 1 + \sum_{k \geq 1} c_{k,V}^{NS} a_{s,V}^k, \quad C_V^{SI}(a_{s,V}) = \sum_{k \geq 4} c_{k,V}^{SI} a_{s,V}^k, \quad (29a)$$

$$c_{1,V}^{NS} = -\frac{3}{4}C_F, \quad (29b)$$

$$c_{2,V}^{NS} = \frac{21}{32}C_F^2 - \frac{19}{24}C_F C_A + \frac{1}{12}C_F T_F n_f, \quad (29c)$$

$$\begin{aligned} c_{3,V}^{NS} = & -\frac{3}{128}C_F^3 + \left(\frac{295}{288} - \frac{11}{12}\zeta_3\right)C_F^2 C_A + \left(\frac{73}{36} - \frac{\zeta_3}{8} - \frac{5}{6}\zeta_5\right)C_F C_A T_F n_f \\ & + \left(-\frac{4231}{1152} + \frac{11}{32}\zeta_3 + \frac{55}{24}\zeta_5 + \frac{3}{16}\pi^2 - \frac{3}{256}\pi^4\right)C_F C_A^2 - \frac{5}{24}C_F T_F^2 n_f^2 \\ & + \left(-\frac{13}{36} + \frac{\zeta_3}{3}\right)C_F^2 T_F n_f, \end{aligned} \quad (29d)$$

$$\begin{aligned} c_{4,V}^{NS} = & \left(-\frac{4823}{2048} - \frac{3}{8}\zeta_3\right)C_F^4 + \left(-\frac{857}{1152} - \frac{971}{96}\zeta_3 + \frac{1045}{48}\zeta_5\right)C_F^3 C_A \\ & + \left(\frac{776809}{55296} + \frac{4921}{384}\zeta_3 - \frac{1375}{144}\zeta_5 - \frac{385}{16}\zeta_7 - \frac{21}{64}\pi^2 + \frac{21}{1024}\pi^4\right)C_F^2 C_A^2 \\ & + \left[-\frac{247307}{13824} + \frac{4579}{1152}\zeta_3 + \frac{5557}{4608}\zeta_5 - \frac{3223}{1536}\zeta_7 + \frac{385}{64}\zeta_9 + \frac{27}{16}s_6 - \frac{4621}{258048}\pi^6\right. \\ & + \left.\pi^4\left(\frac{2953}{46080} - \frac{5}{192}\log 2 - \frac{5}{96}\log^2 2\right) + \pi^2\left(-\frac{1361}{4608} + \frac{525}{512}\zeta_3 + \frac{73}{32}\alpha_4 - \frac{461}{384}\log 2\right.\right. \\ & + \left.\left.\frac{217}{256}\zeta_3 \log 2\right)\right]C_F C_A^3 + \left(\frac{317}{144} + \frac{109}{24}\zeta_3 - \frac{95}{12}\zeta_5\right)C_F^3 T_F n_f + \left(-\frac{14177}{1728} - \frac{739}{144}\zeta_3\right. \\ & + \left.\frac{205}{72}\zeta_5 + \frac{35}{4}\zeta_7\right)C_F^2 C_A T_F n_f + \left[\frac{47693}{3456} - \frac{77}{18}\zeta_3 + \frac{851}{512}\zeta_5 + \frac{1921}{1536}\zeta_7 - \frac{35}{16}\zeta_9 - \frac{9}{16}s_6\right. \\ & + \left.\frac{761}{215040}\pi^6 + \pi^4\left(-\frac{235}{4608} - \frac{5}{768}\log 2 + \frac{3}{256}\log^2 2\right) + \pi^2\left(\frac{641}{2304} - \frac{19}{256}\zeta_3 - \frac{3}{8}\alpha_4\right.\right. \\ & - \left.\left.\frac{\log 2}{64} - \frac{21}{128}\zeta_3 \log 2\right)\right]C_F C_A^2 T_F n_f + \left(\frac{1891}{3456} - \frac{\zeta_3}{36}\right)C_F^2 T_F^2 n_f^2 + \left(-\frac{8309}{3456} + \frac{9}{8}\zeta_3\right. \\ & - \left.\frac{35}{36}\zeta_5 - \frac{\zeta_3^2}{6} + \frac{\pi^4}{180}\right)C_F C_A T_F^2 n_f^2 + \frac{5}{72}C_F T_F^3 n_f^3 + \left(-\frac{3}{16} + \frac{\zeta_3}{4} + \frac{5}{4}\zeta_5\right)\frac{d_F^{abcd} d_A^{abcd}}{d_R} \\ & + \left(\frac{13}{16} + \zeta_3 - \frac{5}{2}\zeta_5\right)\frac{d_F^{abcd} d_F^{abcd}}{d_R} n_f + \left[\frac{1511}{3840}\pi^6 + \pi^4\left(-\frac{117}{64} + \frac{35}{16}\log 2 + \frac{31}{16}\log^2 2\right)\right. \\ & + \left.\pi^2\left(\frac{929}{96} - \frac{827}{32}\zeta_3 - \frac{111}{2}\alpha_4 + \frac{461}{8}\log 2 - \frac{651}{16}\zeta_3 \log 2\right)\right]C_F \frac{d_F^{abcd} d_A^{abcd}}{N_A} + \left[\frac{5}{128}\pi^6\right. \\ & - \left.\pi^4\left(\frac{23}{32} - \frac{\log 2}{8} + \frac{3}{8}\log^2 2\right) + \pi^2\left(\frac{79}{48} - \frac{61}{16}\zeta_3 + \frac{3}{4}\log 2 + \frac{63}{8}\zeta_3 \log 2\right)\right]C_F \frac{d_F^{abcd} d_F^{abcd}}{N_A} n_f, \\ c_{4,V}^{SI} = & c_4^{SI} = \frac{1}{9}\beta_0 d^{abc} d^{abc}. \end{aligned} \quad (29f)$$

Comparing now Eqs.(19e) and (29e), we can reveal certain similarities between analytic expres-

sions for $d_{4,V}^{NS}$ and $c_{4,V}^{NS}$. For instance, the contributions proportional to $d_F^{abcd}d_A^{abcd}/d_R$, $d_F^{abcd}d_F^{abcd}n_f/d_R$, $C_F d_F^{abcd}d_A^{abcd}/N_A$, $C_F d_F^{abcd}d_F^{abcd}n_f/N_A$ color structures in their expressions are identical in absolute values, but opposite in sign. Moreover, the terms proportional to π^6 , s_6 , $\pi^4 \log 2$, $\pi^4 \log^2 2$, $\pi^2 \alpha_4$, $\pi^2 \log 2$ and $\pi^2 \zeta_3 \log 2$ possess the same property. Therefore, all these color structures and transcendental constants are canceled out automatically in the sum of $d_{4,V}^{NS} + c_{4,V}^{NS}$. This fact will turn out to be important upon studying conditions of the β -function factorization in the CBK relation in the V-scheme (see discussions below).

In the case of the $SU(3)$ group we obtain the following numerical form of the PT coefficients of $C_{Bjp,V}$ -function:

$$C_{Bjp,V}(a_{s,V}) = 1 + \sum_{k \geq 1} c_{k,V} a_{s,V}^k, \quad (30a)$$

$$c_{1,V} = -1, \quad (30b)$$

$$c_{2,V} = -2 + 0.0555556n_f, \quad (30c)$$

$$c_{3,V} = -2.55978 + 2.062006n_f - 0.0694444n_f^2, \quad (30d)$$

$$c_{4,V} = -122.1910 + 30.87144n_f - 1.531353n_f^2 + 0.0115741n_f^3 + (12.22222 - 0.740741n_f)\eta_f, \quad (30e)$$

where $\eta_f = \sum_f Q_f$.

3.4 PT series for the Adler function, R -ratio and the coefficient Bjorken function in the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ -, V- and Landau mMOM-schemes

For comparison of the behavior of the PT series for the Adler and the coefficient Bjorken functions, we consider their expressions in the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ - [18, 64–70], [72–74, 76], V- (20b-20d), (22), (30c-30e), [28] and mMOM-scheme in the Landau gauge [15, 29, 31] in the case of the $SU(3)$ color gauge group. Taking the results of the quoted works into account, we can present them in the form of Table 1.

The content of Table 1 indicates that the contributions to the NS coefficient Bjorken function in all three schemes have sign-alternating structure in n_f . This property is also valid for the higher order corrections to the Adler function in the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ -scheme. In other cases, this feature is violated starting from the a_s^3 term. This fact may be considered as the argument in favor of the well-known statement that the renormalon-motivated large- β_0 approximation is more pronounced for quantities calculated from perturbation theory in the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ -scheme in the Euclidean domain [77]. Note, however, that the PT expressions for the Adler function and the coefficient function of the Bjorken polarized sum rule in the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ -scheme contain the contributions not only of the ultraviolet (UV) renormalons resulting in sign-alternating series, but also contributions of the infrared (IR) ones, which lead to the sign-constant series (see e.g. [77, 78] and references therein). The possible irregularities in low orders may be caused by cancellations between IR and UV renormalons.

One should also mention that the analytical expressions for $D(Q^2)$, $R(s)$ and $C_{Bjp}(Q^2)$ at the $\mathcal{O}(a_s^4)$ level in the mMOM-scheme with arbitrary linear covariant gauge parameter can be found in Refs.[15, 27, 28]. The investigation of the behavior of the $R(s)$ -ratio for process $e^+e^- \rightarrow \gamma^* \rightarrow \text{hadrons}$ depending on the energy of the center of mass system and the study of its scheme dependence on the example of the three discussed renormalization schemes have been considered at $n_f = 4, 5$ previously in Refs.[14, 28].

Scheme	The Adler function
$\overline{\text{MS}}$	$1 + a_s + (1.9857 - 0.11529n_f)a_s^2 + (18.2427 - 4.2158n_f + 0.0862n_f^2 - 0.413\delta_f)a_s^3$ $+ (135.792 - 34.440n_f + 1.875n_f^2 - 0.010n_f^3 + \delta_f(-5.942 + 0.1916n_f))a_s^4$
V	$1 + a_{s,V} + (-0.5976 + 0.1625n_f)a_{s,V}^2 + (-7.2164 - 1.240n_f + 0.0993n_f^2 - 0.413\delta_f)a_{s,V}^3$ $+ (19.944 + 4.387n_f - 1.115n_f^2 + 0.056n_f^3 + \delta_f(-2.740 - 0.1527n_f))a_{s,V}^4$
mMOM $\xi = 0$	$1 + a_{s,M} + (-1.535 + 0.1625n_f)a_{s,M}^2 + (-0.6647 - 1.685n_f + 0.0993n_f^2 - 0.413\delta_f)a_{s,M}^3$ $+ (-38.363 + 18.44n_f - 1.71n_f^2 + 0.056n_f^3 + \delta_f(-1.578 - 0.1527n_f))a_{s,M}^4$
	The R -ratio
$\overline{\text{MS}}$	$1 + a_s + (1.9857 - 0.11529n_f)a_s^2 + (-6.6369 - 1.2000n_f - 0.00518n_f^2 - 0.413\delta_f)a_s^3$ $+ (-156.608 + 18.7748n_f - 0.7974n_f^2 + 0.0215n_f^3 + \delta_f(-5.942 + 0.1916n_f))a_s^4$
V	$1 + a_{s,V} + (-0.5976 + 0.1625n_f)a_{s,V}^2 + (-32.096 + 1.775n_f + 0.0079n_f^2 - 0.413\delta_f)a_{s,V}^3$ $+ (-79.639 + 13.497n_f - 0.566n_f^2 + 0.0119n_f^3 + \delta_f(-2.740 - 0.1527n_f))a_{s,V}^4$
mMOM $\xi = 0$	$1 + a_{s,M} + (-1.535 + 0.1625n_f)a_{s,M}^2 + (-25.544 + 1.331n_f + 0.0079n_f^2 - 0.413\delta_f)a_{s,M}^3$ $+ (-67.981 + 19.068n_f - 0.904n_f^2 + 0.0114n_f^3 + \delta_f(-1.578 - 0.1527n_f))a_{s,M}^4$
	The coefficient Bjorken function
$\overline{\text{MS}}$	$1 - a_s + (-4.5833 + 0.33333n_f)a_s^2 + (-41.4399 + 7.6073n_f - 0.1775n_f^2)a_s^3$ $+ (-479.448 + 123.39n_f - 7.69n_f^2 + 0.104n_f^3 + \eta_f(12.222 - 0.7407n_f))a_s^4$
V	$1 - a_{s,V} + (-2 + 0.05556n_f)a_{s,V}^2 + (-2.5598 + 2.062n_f - 0.0694n_f^2)a_{s,V}^3$ $+ (-122.191 + 30.871n_f - 1.531n_f^2 + 0.011157n_f^3 + \eta_f(12.222 - 0.7407n_f))a_{s,V}^4$
mMOM $\xi = 0$	$1 - a_{s,M} + (-1.0625 + 0.05556n_f)a_{s,M}^2 + (-4.2409 + 2.097n_f - 0.0694n_f^2)a_{s,M}^3$ $+ (-66.891 + 17.790n_f - 1.091n_f^2 + 0.0120n_f^3 + \eta_f(12.222 - 0.7407n_f))a_{s,M}^4$

Table 1: The PT series for the Adler function, $R(s)$ -ratio and the coefficient function of the Bjorken polarized sum rule in QCD in the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ -, V- and the Landau mMOM schemes. The total factor $3 \sum_f Q_f^2$ is omitted in the expressions for $D(Q^2)$ and $R(s)$. Here $\delta_f = (\sum_f Q_f)^2 / (\sum_f Q_f^2)$ and $\eta_f = \sum_f Q_f$.

4 The CBK relation in the V-scheme

After we have received the analytic fourth-order approximations for the Adler function, the coefficient function of the Bjorken polarized sum rule and β -function in the V-scheme in the previous subsections, we are able to examine the CBK relation (6) in this scheme in detail. As known the CBK relation is implemented in the class of gauge-invariant MS-like schemes at the $\mathcal{O}(a_s^4)$ level of PT at least [17, 18] (but apparently in all orders [24–26]). However, the following question remains open: whether this relation will be carried out in other gauge-independent schemes different than the MS-like ones. In this section we will investigate this issue on the example of the considered gauge-invariant V-scheme.

In fact, our problem reduces to verification of the presence of the β -factorization property in the conformal symmetry breaking term Δ_{csb} in the CBK relation in the V-scheme:

$$D_V^{NS}(a_{s,V})C_{Bjp,V}^{NS}(a_{s,V}) = 1 + \left(\frac{\beta^V(a_{s,V})}{a_{s,V}} \right) K^V(a_{s,V}). \quad (31)$$

Using the V-scheme analogs of Eqs.(2.3a-2.3d) from Ref.[15], which also follow from the formula (31) we are testing, one can obtain that the first coefficient in expansion

$$K^V(a_{s,V}) = \sum_{n \geq 1} K_n^V a_{s,V}^n \quad (32)$$

coincides with its $\overline{\text{MS}}$ -scheme analog, viz

$$K_1^V = \left(-\frac{21}{8} + 3\zeta_3 \right) C_F. \quad (33)$$

Similarly, utilizing the V-scheme results for a_s^3 -corrections to the flavor NS Adler function (19d), the coefficient function of the Bjorken polarized sum rule (29d) and two-loop contribution to β^V (14b), we find the second term in the expansion (32):

$$K_2^V = \left(\frac{397}{96} + \frac{17}{2}\zeta_3 - 15\zeta_5 \right) C_F^2 + \left(-\frac{1453}{96} + \frac{53}{4}\zeta_3 \right) C_F C_A + \left(\frac{31}{8} - 3\zeta_3 \right) C_F T_F n_f. \quad (34)$$

In expression (34) the analytical term, proportional to C_F^2 -factor, is identical to its $\overline{\text{MS}}$ - [17] and mMOM-scheme counterparts at $\xi = 0^3$ [15, 27, 28]. However, another V-scheme abelian contribution (34), containing $C_F T_F n_f$ -color structure, coincides with the Landau mMOM analog [15, 27, 28] only, but not with $\overline{\text{MS}}$ -scheme term [17]. The reason for this lies in the feature of determination of the mMOM-scheme [29, 30]. Indeed, the relation between couplings $a_{s,M}$ in the mMOM-scheme and a_s in the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ -one requires knowledge of the renormalization constants of the gluon and ghost fields only, but not of any vertex structures [29]. Taking the renormalization mMOM-conditions into account, one can arrive to the following relation [15, 29, 30, 32]:

$$a_{s,M}(\mu^2) = \frac{a_s(\mu^2)}{\left(1 + \Pi_A(a_s(\mu^2), \xi(\mu^2)) \right) \left(1 + \Pi_c(a_s(\mu^2), \xi(\mu^2)) \right)^2}, \quad (35)$$

where Π_A and Π_c are the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ -scheme gluon and ghosts self-energy functions correspondingly. They were calculated with explicit dependence on the gauge parameter ξ at three-loop level in Ref.[79] and at the four-loop level in Ref.[32]. Since in the abelian limit of the $U(1)$ -group all gauge-dependent terms, proportional to the eigenvalue C_A of the Casimir operator in the adjoint representation, are nullified, and $C_F^i (T_F n_f)^j$ -contributions remain with $C_F = 1$ and $T_F = 1$, then the $U(1)$ -analog of the formula (35) read

$$a_M(\mu^2) = \frac{a(\mu^2)}{1 + \Pi_{QED}(a(\mu^2))} = a_{\text{MOM}}(\mu^2) = a_{\text{inv}}(\mu^2). \quad (36)$$

The l.h.s. of the formula (36) matches the definition of the RG-invariant and scheme-independent invariant charge in QED, governed the higher order corrections to the Coulomb static potential in QED (except for the light-by-light-type contributions that are appeared starting from the $\mathcal{O}(a^3)$ level and are not included in the photon vacuum polarization function in Eq.(36)). This fact makes

³ As well as the mMOM-analogs in gauges $\xi = -1$ and $\xi = -3$.

the gauge-dependent mMOM- and gauge-invariant V-schemes akin in QCD. That is why the abelian C_F^2 and $C_F T_F n_f$ -terms in Eq.(34) coincide in these two different schemes.

Using now the a_s^4 approximations for the NS contributions to $D(Q^2)$ (19e), to $C_{Bjp}(Q^2)$ (29e) and the three-loop expression for β^V (14c), we obtain the third term in (32):

$$\begin{aligned}
K_3^V = & \left(\frac{2471}{768} + \frac{61}{8}\zeta_3 - \frac{715}{8}\zeta_5 + \frac{315}{4}\zeta_7 \right) C_F^3 \\
& + \left(\frac{75143}{2304} + \frac{2059}{32}\zeta_3 - \frac{545}{6}\zeta_5 - \frac{105}{8}\zeta_7 \right) C_F^2 C_A + \left(-\frac{1273}{144} - \frac{599}{24}\zeta_3 + \frac{75}{2}\zeta_5 \right) C_F^2 T_F n_f \\
& + \left(-\frac{71389}{576} + \frac{15235}{192}\zeta_3 + \frac{2975}{48}\zeta_5 - \frac{187}{8}\zeta_3^2 + \frac{63}{32}\pi^2 - \frac{9}{4}\pi^2\zeta_3 - \frac{63}{512}\pi^4 + \frac{9}{64}\pi^4\zeta_3 \right) C_F C_A^2 \\
& + \left(\frac{40931}{576} - \frac{1771}{48}\zeta_3 - \frac{125}{3}\zeta_5 + \frac{17}{2}\zeta_3^2 \right) C_F C_A T_F n_f + \left(-\frac{49}{6} + \frac{7}{2}\zeta_3 + 5\zeta_5 \right) C_F T_F^2 n_f^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{37}$$

As we have anticipated, all abelian contributions in (37) are the same as in the mMOM-scheme in Landau gauge [15] (unlike the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ results, where only C_F^3 -term is equal to the V-scheme one). However, in contrast to both $\overline{\text{MS}}$ - and mMOM-scheme cases, the V-scheme K_3^V -coefficient contains extra π^2 , $\pi^2\zeta_3$, π^4 and $\pi^4\zeta_3$ -terms to $C_F C_A^2$ color structure. The other two non-abelian pieces, proportional to $C_F^2 C_A$ and $C_F C_A T_F n_f$, repeat the transcendental pattern of the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ - and Landau mMOM-scheme results for K_3 -coefficient.

As we have already noted above, the light-by-light (l-b-l) type scattering terms with $d_F^{abcd} d_A^{abcd}/d_R$, $d_F^{abcd} d_F^{abcd} n_f/d_R$, $C_F d_F^{abcd} d_A^{abcd}/N_A$ and $C_F d_F^{abcd} d_F^{abcd} n_f/N_A$ color factors including in $d_{4,V}^{NS}$ (19e) and $c_{4,V}^{NS}$ (29e) are canceled out exactly in the expression $d_{4,V}^{NS} + c_{4,V}^{NS}$, which is equal to:

$$(d_{4,V}^{NS} + c_{4,V}^{NS}) \Big|_{l-b-l} = (d_4^{NS} + c_4^{NS}) \Big|_{l-b-l} - a_3 (d_1^{NS} + c_1^{NS}) \Big|_{l-b-l}. \tag{38a}$$

The formula (38a) follows directly from the RG-invariance of $D(Q^2)$ and $C_{Bjp}(Q^2)$ functions, and from the relation (10). One should emphasize that the discussed mutual cancellation is the consequence of the conformal symmetry. Indeed, the equality $d_1^{NS} + c_1^{NS} = 0$ is the attribute of the CBK relation and arises from the non-renormalizability of the AVV triangle graph at the $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s)$ level. This feature was confirmed by direct calculations in [80]. Therefore, in this order the application of the renormalization procedure does not lead to the appearance of the conformal symmetry breaking term in the CBK relation. In its turn, in the conformal invariant limit when all coefficients β_k of the RG β -function are nullified, the sum $d_4^{NS} + c_4^{NS}$ in the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ -scheme are expressed only through terms d_k and c_k at $1 \leq k \leq 3$ (see e.g. Eq.(2.3d) of Ref.[15]), which do not contain the l-b-l contributions. This means that the equality $(d_4^{NS} + c_4^{NS})|_{l-b-l} = 0$ is the consequence of the conformal symmetry [19]. Based on these arguments, we conclude that l.h.s. of Eq.(38a) is identically equal to zero:

$$(d_{4,V}^{NS} + c_{4,V}^{NS}) \Big|_{l-b-l} = 0. \tag{38b}$$

This feature is extremely important for factorization of the β -function in the CBK relation at the $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s^4)$ level. In a full analogy, one can show that the terms, originating from expression (4) for a_3 -coefficient and proportional to π^6 , s_6 , $\pi^4 \log 2$, $\pi^4 \log^2 2$, $\pi^2 \alpha_4$, $\pi^2 \log 2$ and $\pi^2 \zeta_3 \log 2$ -numbers,

are mutually canceled out in the sum $d_{4,V}^{NS} + c_{4,V}^{NS}$. This fact is the consequence of the conformal symmetry as well⁴.

So, we have demonstrated that the factorization of β^V -function in the CBK relation in the V-scheme is performed in the fourth order of PT at least. The natural question arises: will this factorization property be also true in other gauge-invariant renormalization schemes other than the V- or MS-like ones? We give response to this issue in the next section.

5 The CBK relation in different gauge-invariant schemes

In this section we continue to develop the ideas proposed in Ref.[15]. There were investigated the requirements for the gauge-dependent schemes that would ensure fulfillment of the CBK relation. It turns out that if the CBK relation in QCD is valid in the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ -scheme in all orders of PT (the grounds to trust this assumption are given in Refs.[24–26]), then it will be true for a wide class of the MOM-like schemes with linear covariant Landau gauge in all orders as well. Let us now extend the ideas of Ref.[15] applied to a class of the gauge-invariant renormalization schemes.

We will conduct our study for the particular case of the V-scheme. Without limiting generality, *it is possible to understand by the V-scheme any other gauge-invariant scheme* whose coupling constant is related to a_s in the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ -scheme by the relation à-la (10) with some coefficients a_k .

Taking into account the RG-invariance of functions $D^{NS}(a_s)$ and $C_{Bjp}^{NS}(a_s)$ and using the explicit form of the conformal symmetry breaking term in the CBK relation, we gain the following equality

$$\frac{\beta(a_s)}{a_s} K(a_s) = \frac{\beta^V(a_{s,V}(a_s))}{a_{s,V}(a_s)} K^V(a_{s,V}(a_s)), \quad (39)$$

linking the polynomials $K(a_s)$ and $K^V(a_{s,V})$ in the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ - and V- (*arbitrary gauge-invariant*) scheme correspondingly. Utilizing the scheme independence of the first two coefficients of the RG β -function (14a-14b) within a class of the gauge-invariant schemes and substituting Eq.(10) in (39), we get the following relationships between the V- and $\overline{\text{MS}}$ -scheme coefficients of the polynomial $K(a_s)$:

$$K_1^V = K_1, \quad (40)$$

$$K_2^V = K_2 - 2a_1 K_1. \quad (41)$$

The $\overline{\text{MS}}$ coefficients K_1 and K_2 were first calculated in [17]. Accommodating their explicit form, we find that formulas (40) and (41) are in full agreement with results of the direct calculation (33) and (34). The expression (41) is analogous to Eq.(4.3) of Ref.[15] that presents the relation between K_2 -coefficients in the mMOM and $\overline{\text{MS}}$ -scheme. However, unlike this attitude, the equation (41) does not contain terms with $1/\beta_0$ -factor. This fact is a consequence of scheme independence of two-loop coefficient β_1 in a class of the gauge-invariant renormalization schemes like the V-scheme. Remind that in the gauge-dependent schemes, such as mMOM, the two-loop coefficient of the β -function already depends on gauge. Despite this fact, it was found out in Ref.[15] that the CBK relation holds in the mMOM-scheme in the $\mathcal{O}(a_s^3)$ approximation for three values of the gauge parameter only, namely for $\xi = 0, -1, -3$. The mentioned $1/\beta_0$ -term disappears at these values of ξ .

⁴The interesting consequences of the violation of the conformal symmetry are briefly discussed in Appendix B.

Carrying out similar steps in the next order PT, we obtain

$$K_3^V = K_3 - 3a_1K_2 + \left(\frac{\beta_2 - \beta_2^V - a_1\beta_1}{\beta_0} + 5a_1^2 - 2a_2 \right) K_1. \quad (42)$$

Taking now into account Eq.(13b), we derive the simplified form of Eq.(42) without $1/\beta_0$ -factor:

$$K_3^V = K_3 - 3a_1K_2 + (6a_1^2 - 3a_2)K_1. \quad (43)$$

The coefficient K_3 is known from results of work [18]. The application of the formula (43) reproduces the expression (37). Note also that the final structure of Eq.(43) is much simpler than the analogous one, presented in Eq.(4.7) of Ref.[15] for the mMOM-scheme with arbitrary gauge. As was shown in this quoted work, at the $\mathcal{O}(a_s^4)$ level the CBK relation remains valid in the mMOM-scheme (and other QCD MOM-like schemes) only for the Landau gauge $\xi = 0$.

Further, proceeding in a similar way and employing Eqs.(13b-13d), we straightforwardly get

$$K_4^V = K_4 - 4a_1K_3 + (10a_1^2 - 4a_2)K_2 + (20a_1a_2 - 20a_1^3 - 4a_3)K_1, \quad (44)$$

$$K_5^V = K_5 - 5a_1K_4 + (15a_1^2 - 5a_2)K_3 + (30a_1a_2 - 35a_1^3 - 5a_3)K_2 + (30a_1a_3 + 15a_2^2 - 105a_1^2a_2 + 70a_1^4 - 5a_4)K_1. \quad (45)$$

where K_4 and K_5 are still unknown $\overline{\text{MS}}$ -scheme coefficients of Eq.(6), a_4 is yet completely unknown four-loop correction to the static potential in QCD (1).

There are no obstacles to obtain similar representations of K_n^V -terms for any order of PT. Thus, we are convinced that if the CBK relation in QCD is valid in the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ -scheme in all orders of PT, then it will be also true for arbitrary gauge-invariant renormalization scheme with “non-exotic” coefficients a_k included in the ratio between couplings in this considered scheme and in the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ -scheme (see analog of Eq.(10)). Under “non-exotic” coefficients we imply such ones that are the polynomials in n_f with coefficients which are algebraic or transcendental numbers. For example, in the gauge-invariant 't Hooft scheme [81, 82] the coefficients a_k are not polynomials in n_f , they contain terms proportional to $1/\beta_0$ -factors. The feature of this scheme lies in the fact that its β -function contains two nonzero scheme-independent PT coefficients only and the rest are assumed to be zero by finite renormalization of charge. As was shown in Ref.[83], the transition from the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ -scheme to the 't Hooft scheme spoils the property of factorization of the β -function in the CBK relation.

6 The QED case

Let us now consider the QED case with N charged leptons. The transition to the abelian $U(1)$ gauge group is performed by replacing $C_A = 0$, $C_F = 1$, $T_F = 1$, $d_A^{abcd} = 0$, $d_F^{abcd} = 1$, $d^{abc} = 1$, $N_A = 1$, $d_R = 1$, $n_f = N$.

Using the analytical expression for the four-loop approximation of β -function in the V-scheme in the case of the generic simple gauge group (14a-14d) and taking into account the transition discussed above, one can obtain the QED analog of the β -function in the V-scheme:

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_{QED}^V(a_V) &= \frac{1}{3}Na_V^2 + \frac{1}{4}Na_V^3 + \left(-\frac{1}{32}N + \left(\frac{1}{3}\zeta_3 - \frac{23}{72} \right) N^2 \right) a_V^4 \\ &+ \left(-\frac{23}{128}N + \left(\frac{13}{32} + \frac{2}{3}\zeta_3 - \frac{5}{3}\zeta_5 + \frac{2}{3}\mathcal{C} \right) N^2 + \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{3}\zeta_3 \right) N^3 \right) a_V^5, \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

where $a_V = \alpha_V/\pi$. The introduced constant \mathcal{C} arises naturally in the definition of the static Coulomb potential through the QED invariant charge:

$$V_{QED}(\vec{q}^2) = -\frac{4\pi}{\vec{q}^2} \frac{\alpha(\mu^2)}{1 + \Pi_{QED}(\vec{q}^2/\mu^2, \alpha)} \left(1 + N \cdot \mathcal{C} \left(\frac{\alpha}{\pi} \right)^3 + \dots \right). \quad (47)$$

Here \mathcal{C} is the correction associated with the appearance of the light-by-light type scattering diagrams to the static potential [13], which do not occur in the photon vacuum polarization function Π_{QED} at this level [11]:

$$\mathcal{C} = \frac{5}{96}\pi^6 - \pi^4 \left(\frac{23}{24} - \frac{\log 2}{6} + \frac{\log^2 2}{2} \right) + \pi^2 \left(\frac{79}{36} - \frac{61}{12}\zeta_3 + \log 2 + \frac{21}{2}\zeta_3 \log 2 \right) \approx -0.888062. \quad (48)$$

The numerical effect of the term $2\mathcal{C}N^2a_V^5/3$ in (46) is not negligible compared to the contribution of the remaining part, proportional to $N^2a_V^5$, but on the contrary, it even dominates it.

The expression (46) should be compared with the QED result for β -function in the MOM-scheme identical to the Gell-Mann–Low Ψ -function [84]:

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_{QED}^{\text{MOM}}(a_{\text{MOM}}) = \Psi(a_{\text{MOM}}) &= \frac{1}{3}Na_{\text{MOM}}^2 + \frac{1}{4}Na_{\text{MOM}}^3 + \left(-\frac{1}{32}N + \left(\frac{1}{3}\zeta_3 - \frac{23}{72} \right)N^2 \right)a_{\text{MOM}}^4 \\ &+ \left(-\frac{23}{128}N + \left(\frac{13}{32} + \frac{2}{3}\zeta_3 - \frac{5}{3}\zeta_5 \right)N^2 + \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{3}\zeta_3 \right)N^3 \right)a_{\text{MOM}}^5, \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

where $a_{\text{MOM}} = \alpha_{\text{MOM}}/\pi$ coincides with the QED invariant charge (36). Note that the expression (49) may be also obtained e.g. as a result of the transition to the case of the $U(1)$ group for the β -function computed initially in the mMOM-scheme in the generic simple gauge group [30, 32]. This fact is explained and directly follows from the formulas (35) and (36).

One can see that at the three-loop level β_{QED}^V (46) completely coincides in form with the Gell-Mann–Low Ψ -function (49). The difference between them starts to manifest itself only at the four-loop level due to the additional term $2\mathcal{C}N^2a_V^5/3$, related to the light-by-light type scattering effect in the perturbative expression for the static Coulomb potential (47):

$$\beta_{3,QED}^V = \Psi_3 + \frac{2}{3}\mathcal{C}N^2. \quad (50)$$

The obtained result may be presented in the following compact form:

$$a_V = a_{\text{MOM}} + \mathcal{C}Na_{\text{MOM}}^4 + \mathcal{O}(a_{\text{MOM}}^5). \quad (51)$$

The arguments, given in this Section and in Sec.4, enables us to conclude that in QCD the V-scheme possesses many similar properties as the MOM-like schemes in the Landau gauge. Since difference between couplings a_V and a_{MOM} in QED (51) starts to reveal itself from the a^4 -term only, then, with some reservations, the V-scheme in QCD may be interpreted as the gauge-independent scheme in which one can construct an analog of the gauge-invariant charge, namely the gauge-invariant combinations of the related Green functions. Remind, it is impossible to introduce this concept within the gauge-dependent MOM-like schemes in QCD. For details see e.g. [14].

Setting $N = 1$ in Eqs.(46) and (49), we arrive to their numerical form:

$$\beta_{QED}^V(a_V) = 0.3333a_V^2 + 0.25a_V^3 + 0.0499a_V^4 - 1.19301a_V^5, \quad (52)$$

$$\Psi(a_{\text{MOM}}) = 0.3333a_{\text{MOM}}^2 + 0.25a_{\text{MOM}}^3 + 0.0499a_{\text{MOM}}^4 - 0.60096a_{\text{MOM}}^5. \quad (53)$$

One can observe that even at $N = 1$ the numerical effect of the light-by-light scattering contribution, which is typical for the V-scheme, is rather sizable and is almost equal to twice four-loop correction to the Ψ -function.

Let us turn to the consideration of relations between higher order corrections to β_{QED}^V and Ψ -function. The dependence of these RG-functions on the number N of the charged leptons is described via the following decompositions:

$$\beta_{QED}^V(a_V) = \beta_{QED,0}^{V(1)}Na_V^2 + \sum_{i \geq 1} \sum_{k=1}^i \beta_{QED,i}^{V(k)}N^k a_V^{i+2}, \quad (54)$$

$$\Psi(a_{\text{MOM}}) = \Psi_0^{(1)}Na_{\text{MOM}}^2 + \sum_{i \geq 1} \sum_{k=1}^i \Psi_i^{(k)}N^k a_{\text{MOM}}^{i+2}. \quad (55)$$

As we have already seen, the coefficients $\beta_{QED,i}^{V(k)}$ and $\Psi_i^{(k)}$ will differ only by corrections $\Delta\beta_{QED,i}^{V(k)}$ associated to the light-by-light scattering-type effects in the static potential:

$$\beta_{QED,i}^{V(k)} = \Psi_i^{(k)} + \Delta\beta_{QED,i}^{V(k)}. \quad (56)$$

This fact directly follows from the definition of the coupling constant a^V in the V-scheme (QED-analog of Eq.(8) and (47)) and from relation (36). It is clear that the extra term $\Delta\beta_{QED,i}^{V(k)}$ will appear only for indexes $\{i, k\} = \{i \geq 3, 2 \leq k \leq i-1\}$. In cases when $\{i, k\} = \{i \geq 3, k = 1 \text{ or } k = i\}$, the coefficients of β^V and Ψ -functions coincide. Indeed, we have already observed that at the four-loop level

$$\beta_{QED,3}^{V(1)} = \Psi_3^{(1)} = -\frac{23}{128}, \quad \beta_{QED,3}^{V(3)} = \Psi_3^{(3)} = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{3}\zeta_3. \quad (57)$$

The RG β -function in the MOM-scheme (the Gell-Mann–Low Ψ -function) was calculated in the fifth-loop approximation in QED in [85] for arbitrary N (and in the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ -scheme as well):

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_4 = & \left(\frac{4157}{6144} + \frac{1}{8}\zeta_3 \right) N + \left(-\frac{251}{256} - \frac{23}{24}\zeta_3 - \frac{45}{8}\zeta_5 + \frac{35}{4}\zeta_7 \right) N^2 \\ & + \left(-\frac{3383}{3456} - \frac{205}{72}\zeta_3 + \frac{5}{2}\zeta_5 + \zeta_3^2 \right) N^3 + \left(-\frac{67}{72} + \frac{7}{18}\zeta_3 + \frac{5}{9}\zeta_5 \right) N^4. \end{aligned} \quad (58)$$

For instance, this result may be obtained as the $U(1)$ -limit of the β -function computed at the five-loop level in the mMOM-scheme with arbitrary gauge parameter in the case of the generic simple gauge group in Ref.[32].

Using now the formula (13d) and the expression for β_4 in the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ -scheme [85], we find the five-loop coefficient of β_{QED}^V -function:

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_{QED,4}^V = & \left(\frac{4157}{6144} + \frac{1}{8}\zeta_3 \right) N + \left(-\frac{49}{48} - \frac{53}{96}\zeta_3 + \frac{65}{32}\zeta_5 + \frac{1}{4}\mathcal{C} + a_4^{(1)} \right) N^2 \\ & + \left(-\frac{4255}{4608} + \frac{1013}{144}\zeta_3 - \frac{13}{96}\zeta_4 - \frac{215}{36}\zeta_5 - \frac{5}{3}\zeta_3^2 + \frac{20}{9}\mathcal{C} + a_4^{(2)} \right) N^3 + \left(\frac{118907}{31104} - \frac{71}{24}\zeta_3 + a_4^{(3)} \right) N^4, \end{aligned} \quad (59)$$

where the constant \mathcal{C} has been defined above and, in analogy with Eq.(4), we have utilized the decomposition of the four-loop correction a_4 to the static Coulomb potential in QED in powers of N :

$$a_4 = \left(\frac{5}{9}\right)^4 N^3 + a_4^{(3)} N^3 + a_4^{(2)} N^2 + a_4^{(1)} N. \quad (60)$$

One should note that the term $-13\zeta_4/96$ in the N^3 -coefficient of $\beta_{QED,4}^V$ (59) is not related to the effects of the light-by-light scattering but arises from the calculations of β_4 in the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ -scheme (see [85] and [86, 87]).

As we have expected, the terms linear in N are the same in Eqs.(58) and (59):

$$\beta_{QED,4}^{V(1)} = \Psi_4^{(1)} = \frac{4157}{6144} + \frac{1}{8}\zeta_3. \quad (61)$$

It was explained in Ref.[88] that the scheme-independence of these linear terms in the massless QED is the consequence of the conformal symmetry.

Since coefficients $\beta_{QED,4}^{V(4)}$ and $\Psi_4^{(4)}$ should also be the same, then we can fix the contribution $a_4^{(3)}$ from matching Eqs.(58) and (59):

$$a_4^{(3)} = -\frac{147851}{31104} + \frac{241}{72}\zeta_3 + \frac{5}{9}\zeta_5, \quad (62)$$

$$\beta_{QED,4}^{V(4)} = \Psi_4^{(4)} = -\frac{67}{72} + \frac{7}{18}\zeta_3 + \frac{5}{9}\zeta_5. \quad (63)$$

The four-loop expressions for $\beta_{QED,4}^{V(2)}$ and $\beta_{QED,4}^{V(3)}$ will contain the contributions, related to the light-by-light scattering-type effects in the static potential. They appear and are mixed both from the constant \mathcal{C} , occurring at the three-loop level, and from the fourth-order corrections $a_4^{(1)}$ and $a_4^{(2)}$ (59). Based on results of Ref.[13], one can conclude that the contributions of these effects are separated from other ones by transcendent constants proportional to even powers of the π -number (see Eq.48). Without these still unknown terms, the corrections $a_4^{(1)}$ and $a_4^{(2)}$ read:

$$a_4^{(1)} \Big|_{no\ l-b-l} = \frac{31}{768} - \frac{13}{32}\zeta_3 - \frac{245}{32}\zeta_5 + \frac{35}{4}\zeta_7, \quad (64)$$

$$a_4^{(2)} \Big|_{no\ l-b-l} = -\frac{767}{13824} - \frac{1423}{144}\zeta_3 + \frac{13}{96}\zeta_4 + \frac{305}{36}\zeta_5 + \frac{8}{3}\zeta_3^2. \quad (65)$$

These expressions directly follow from equating $\Psi_4^{(2)}$ to $\beta_{QED,4}^{V(2)}$ and $\Psi_4^{(3)}$ to $\beta_{QED,4}^{V(3)}$ in approximation when the light-by-light scattering effects in the static potential are discarded. In its turn, the following relations are valid:

$$\beta_{QED,4}^{V(2)} = \Psi_4^{(2)} + \Delta\beta_{QED,4}^{V(2)}, \quad \Delta\beta_{QED,4}^{V(2)} = a_4^{(1)} \Big|_{l-b-l} + \frac{1}{4}\mathcal{C}, \quad (66)$$

$$\beta_{QED,4}^{V(3)} = \Psi_4^{(3)} + \Delta\beta_{QED,4}^{V(3)}, \quad \Delta\beta_{QED,4}^{V(3)} = a_4^{(2)} \Big|_{l-b-l} + \frac{20}{9}\mathcal{C}. \quad (67)$$

Formulas (62), (64) and (65) are generalized without significant obstacles to the case of the generic simple gauge group and then look more clearly:

$$a_4^{(3)} \Big|_{abelian} = \left(-\frac{147851}{31104} + \frac{241}{72}\zeta_3 + \frac{5}{9}\zeta_5 \right) C_F T_F^3, \quad (68)$$

$$a_4^{(2)} \Big|_{abelian, no\ l-b-l} = \left(\frac{13025}{13824} - \frac{403}{36}\zeta_3 - \frac{11}{96}\zeta_4 + \frac{175}{18}\zeta_5 + 2\zeta_3^2 \right) C_F^2 T_F^2 \quad (69)$$

$$+ \left(-\frac{431}{432} + \frac{21}{16}\zeta_3 + \frac{1}{4}\zeta_4 - \frac{5}{4}\zeta_5 + \frac{2}{3}\zeta_3^2 \right) \frac{d_F^{abcd} d_F^{abcd}}{N_A},$$

$$a_4^{(1)} \Big|_{abelian, no\ l-b-l} = \left(\frac{31}{768} - \frac{13}{32}\zeta_3 - \frac{245}{32}\zeta_5 + \frac{35}{4}\zeta_7 \right) C_F^3 T_F. \quad (70)$$

The $d_F^{abcd} d_F^{abcd}$ -contribution to $a_4^{(2)}$ (69) originates from $d_F^{abcd} d_F^{abcd}$ -ones to coefficients β_3 and β_4 . This fact may be directly observed from Eq.(13d), where the abelian terms, proportional to C_F and $d_F^{abcd} d_F^{abcd}$, may be fixed from consideration β_4^{mMOM} [32] (whose the abelian contributions in the Landau gauge are equal to those in β_4^V without taking into account the light-by-light scattering-type corrections to the static potential) and from analytical results for β_3 and β_4 [86, 87]. One should emphasize that expressions (68-70) are in full agreement with the analogous results presented in Eq.(14.4) of Ref.[35].

7 Conclusion

In this work we obtain the explicit analytical form of the RG β -function in the gauge-invariant V -scheme at the four-loop level in the case of the generic simple gauge group. Using the renormalization invariance of the Adler function for process of $e^+e^- \rightarrow \gamma^* \rightarrow hadrons$, $R_{e^+e^-}(s)$ -ratio and the coefficient function of the Bjorken polarized sum rule of deep-inelastic scattering of the polarized charged leptons on nucleons, we get their PT expressions in the V -scheme up to α_s^4 -corrections as well. The comparison of the derived V -scheme results with the \overline{MS} - and mMOM-counterparts in the Landau gauge is performed. In the cases of the Adler function and $R_{e^+e^-}(s)$ -ratio in the V - and mMOM-schemes the nonregular behavior of the perturbative corrections in their decomposition in powers of n_f is observed in higher orders. Taking into account the obtained V -scheme results, we demonstrate explicitly that the CBK relation remains valid in this effective scheme at the $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s^4)$ level. Further, we prove our hypothesis that factorization of the RG β -function in the conformal symmetry breaking term of the CBK relation will be true in any gauge-invariant scheme at least in the fourth order of PT. The chosen gauge-invariant scheme should only lead to the “non-exotic” coefficients in the relationship between couplings defined in the \overline{MS} -scheme and in the considered one, i.e. these coefficients should be polynomials in n_f . Moreover, it turns out that if the CBK relation in QCD is valid in the \overline{MS} -scheme in all orders of PT, then it will be true for the discussed gauge-invariant class of the renormalization schemes in all orders as well. We show that in QED the coefficients of the β -function in the V -scheme coincide with the analogous ones in the MOM-scheme at the three-loop level. Starting from the fourth order of PT their N^2 -coefficients begin to differ on correction associated with the manifestation of the effects of the light-by-light scattering in the static potential. The rest terms proportional to N and N^3 stay the same. In even higher orders, this tendency will continue, i.e. two N -dependent terms in the coefficients of the perturbative

expansions of the β_{QED}^V and Ψ -functions will always coincide, and the remaining ones will differ by the correction related to the light-by-light scattering in the static potential. Based on these findings, we predict several contributions to the four-loop correction to the static potential in the case of the generic simple gauge group.

Acknowledgments

The work of VSM was supported by the Russian Science Foundation, agreement no. 21-71-30003.

Appendix A

Let us to consider the question related to the integral representation of the multiple zeta values. In general, these functions are defined as

$$\zeta_{m_1, \dots, m_k} = \sum_{i_1=1}^{\infty} \sum_{i_2=1}^{i_1-1} \cdots \sum_{i_k=1}^{i_{k-1}-1} \prod_{j=1}^k \frac{\text{sign}(m_j)^{i_j}}{i_j^{|m_j|}}. \quad (71)$$

They were studied in detail in the number of works on the subject (see e.g. Refs.[89, 90], [91], [61]). We use the Hurwitz–Lerch zeta function $\Phi(z, s, q)$

$$\Phi(z, s, q) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{z^k}{(k+q)^s} \quad (72)$$

and its integral representation

$$\Phi(z, s, q) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(s)} \int_0^1 \frac{x^{q-1} (-\log x)^{s-1}}{1-zx} dx, \quad (73)$$

which is valid for $\text{Re}(q) > 0$, $\text{Re}(s) > 0$ and $z \in [-1; 1)$ or $\text{Re}(s) > 1$ and $z = 1$.

Then, for the constant $\zeta_{-5, -1}$ with transcendence of weight 6, appearing in the process of calculation of the three-loop correction to the static potential [13], it is possible to write [28]:

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta_{-5, -1} &= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^k}{k^5} \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \frac{(-1)^i}{i} = \frac{15}{16} \zeta_5 \log 2 - \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\Phi(-1, 1, k)}{k^5} \\ &= \frac{15}{16} \zeta_5 \log 2 - \int_0^1 \frac{dx}{x(x+1)} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{x^k}{k^5} = \frac{15}{16} \zeta_5 \log 2 - \zeta_6 + \int_0^1 dx \frac{\text{Li}_5(x)}{x+1}. \end{aligned} \quad (74)$$

Therefore, the constant $s_6 = \zeta_6 + \zeta_{-5, -1}$ may be presented in the following form [90]:

$$s_6 = \frac{15}{16} \zeta_5 \log 2 + \int_0^1 dx \frac{\text{Li}_5(x)}{x+1} \approx 0.9874414. \quad (75)$$

Similarly, one can obtain the integral representations for the following multiple zeta values with concrete arguments arising in the intermediate calculations in the work [13]:

$$\zeta_{5,2} = \zeta_5 \zeta_2 - \zeta_7 + \int_0^1 dx \frac{\text{Li}_5(x) \log x}{1-x} \approx 0.0385751, \quad (76)$$

$$\zeta_{-5,2} = -\frac{15}{16} \zeta_5 \zeta_2 + \frac{63}{64} \zeta_7 + \int_0^1 dx \frac{\text{Li}_5(-x) \log x}{1-x} \approx 0.0271089. \quad (77)$$

For instance, the function $\zeta_{5,3}$ occurs during the computation of the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ -scheme β -function of the $O(N)$ -symmetric ϕ^4 theory in the six-loop approximation [92] (in notations of this quoted paper $\zeta_{3,5}$):

$$\zeta_{5,3} = \zeta_3 \zeta_5 - \zeta_8 - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 dx \frac{\text{Li}_5(x) \log^2(x)}{1-x} \approx 0.0377077. \quad (78)$$

Appendix B

It is interesting to note some common features of the CBK relation and the action sum rule [93–97] (in lattice QCD also known as the Michael sum rule). Indeed, both of them contain a conformal anomaly term, reflecting the effect of violation of the conformal symmetry. However, the second relation may be directly used in the nonperturbative region as well.

Remind that the conformal anomaly in the trace of the energy-momentum tensor of the massless $SU(N_c)$ gauge theory in the Euclidean domain has the following form [98–100]:

$$T_{\mu\mu}(x) = \frac{\beta(a_s)}{2a_s} F_{\mu\nu}^a(x) F_{\mu\nu}^a(x) = 2 \frac{\beta(a_s)}{a_s} \mathcal{L}(x), \quad (79)$$

where $\mathcal{L}(x)$ is the gluonic gauge part of the *Euclidean* Lagrangian density of the $SU(N_c)$ theory, expressed through *Euclidean* chromoelectric and chromomagnetic fields

$$\mathcal{L}(x) = \frac{1}{4} F_{\mu\nu}^a(x) F_{\mu\nu}^a(x) = \frac{1}{2} (\vec{E}(x)^2 + \vec{B}(x)^2). \quad (80)$$

Note that owing to a change in a metric signature, the square of the Euclidean electric field has an opposite sign to its Minkowskian counterpart, while signs of the squares of the Euclidean and Minkowskian magnetic fields coincide. The action sum rule relates the certain combination of the static potential to the Euclidean chromoelectric and chromomagnetic condensates and β -function [93–97]:

$$\tilde{V}(r) + r \frac{\partial \tilde{V}(r)}{\partial r} = \frac{\beta(a_s)}{a_s} \langle \int d^3x (\vec{E}(x)^2 + \vec{B}(x)^2) \rangle_r, \quad (81)$$

where $\tilde{V}(r)$ is the static potential in the coordinate space including the confining and nonconfining components and $\langle \dots \rangle_r$ is the vacuum expectation value in the presence of a static quark-antiquark pair spaced apart from each other at a distance r excluding the analogous contribution without these field sources.

It would be interesting to study the possible relationship of the action sum rule and the CBK relation based on the first principles of quantum field theory.

References

- [1] G. S. Bali, Phys. Rept. **343**, 1-136 (2001) [arXiv:hep-ph/0001312 [hep-ph]].
- [2] F. Karbstein, M. Wagner and M. Weber, Phys. Rev. D **98**, no.11, 114506 (2018) [arXiv:1804.10909 [hep-ph]].
- [3] V. G. Bornyakov and I. E. Kudrov, [arXiv:2301.03076 [hep-lat]].
- [4] N. Brambilla, A. Pineda, J. Soto and A. Vairo, Phys. Rev. D **60**, 091502 (1999) [arXiv:hep-ph/9903355 [hep-ph]].
- [5] N. Brambilla, A. Pineda, J. Soto and A. Vairo, Rev. Mod. Phys. **77** (2005) 1423 [hep-ph/0410047].
- [6] B. A. Kniehl, A. A. Penin, V. A. Smirnov and M. Steinhauser, Nucl. Phys. B **635**, 357-383 (2002) [arXiv:hep-ph/0203166 [hep-ph]].
- [7] W. Fischler, Nucl. Phys. B **129** (1977) 157.
- [8] A. Billoire, Phys. Lett. B **92**, 343 (1980) 343.
- [9] M. Peter, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 602-605 (1997) [arXiv:hep-ph/9610209 [hep-ph]].
- [10] Y. Schroder, Phys. Lett. B **447** (1999) 321. [hep-ph/9812205].
- [11] S. G. Gorishnii, A. L. Kataev and S. A. Larin, Phys. Lett. B **273**, 141 (1991) Erratum: [Phys. Lett. B **275**, 512 (1992)] Erratum: [Phys. Lett. B **341**, 448 (1995)].
- [12] A. V. Smirnov, V. A. Smirnov and M. Steinhauser, Phys. Lett. B **668**, 293-298 (2008) [arXiv:0809.1927 [hep-ph]].
- [13] R. N. Lee, A. V. Smirnov, V. A. Smirnov and M. Steinhauser, Phys. Rev. D **94**, no.5, 054029 (2016) [arXiv:1608.02603 [hep-ph]].
- [14] A. L. Kataev and V. S. Molokoedov, Phys. Rev. D **92**, no.5, 054008 (2015) [arXiv:1507.03547 [hep-ph]].
- [15] A. V. Garkusha, A. L. Kataev and V. S. Molokoedov, JHEP **1802**, 161 (2018) [arXiv:1801.06231 [hep-ph]].
- [16] R. J. Crewther, Phys. Rev. Lett. **28**, 1421 (1972).
- [17] D. J. Broadhurst and A. L. Kataev, Phys. Lett. B **315**, 179 (1993) [hep-ph/9308274].
- [18] P. A. Baikov, K. G. Chetyrkin and J. H. Kuhn, Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 132004 (2010) [arXiv:1001.3606 [hep-ph]].
- [19] A. L. Kataev and S. V. Mikhailov, Theor. Math. Phys. **170**, 139-150 (2012) [arXiv:1011.5248 [hep-ph]].

- [20] G. Cvetic and A. L. Kataev, Phys. Rev. D **94**, no.1, 014006 (2016) [arXiv:1604.00509 [hep-ph]].
- [21] G. Gabadadze and G. Tukhashvili, Phys. Lett. B **782**, 202-209 (2018) [arXiv:1712.09921 [hep-th]].
- [22] P. A. Baikov and S. V. Mikhailov, JHEP **09**, 185 (2022) [arXiv:2206.14063 [hep-ph]].
- [23] K. G. Chetyrkin, Nucl. Phys. B **985**, 115988 (2022) [arXiv:2206.12948 [hep-ph]].
- [24] G. T. Gabadadze and A. L. Kataev, JETP Lett. **61**, 448 (1995) [Pisma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **61**, 439 (1995)] [hep-ph/9502384].
- [25] R. J. Crewther, Phys. Lett. B **397**, 137 (1997) [hep-ph/9701321].
- [26] V. M. Braun, G. P. Korchemsky and D. Müller, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. **51**, 311 (2003) [hep-ph/0306057].
- [27] A. L. Kataev and V. S. Molokoedov, J. Phys. Conf. Ser. **938**, no.1, 012050 (2017) [arXiv:1711.03997 [hep-ph]].
- [28] V. S. Molokoedov, PhD thesis, 2020. In Russian.
<https://www.inr.ru/rus/referat/molokoed/dis.pdf>
- [29] L. von Smekal, K. Maltman and A. Sternbeck, Phys. Lett. B **681**, 336 (2009) [arXiv:0903.1696 [hep-ph]].
- [30] J. A. Gracey, J. Phys. A **46**, 225403 (2013) [arXiv:1304.5347 [hep-ph]].
- [31] J. A. Gracey, Phys. Rev. D **90**, no. 9, 094026 (2014) [arXiv:1410.6715 [hep-ph]].
- [32] B. Ruijl, T. Ueda, J. A. M. Vermaseren and A. Vogt, JHEP **1706**, 040 (2017) [arXiv:1703.08532 [hep-ph]].
- [33] J. Zeng, X. G. Wu, X. C. Zheng and J. M. Shen, Chin. Phys. C **44**, no.11, 113102 (2020) [arXiv:2004.12068 [hep-ph]].
- [34] J. A. Gracey and R. H. Mason, [arXiv:2210.14604 [hep-ph]].
- [35] A. Grozin, [arXiv:2212.05290 [hep-ph]].
- [36] S. J. Brodsky, M. Melles and J. Rathsmann, Phys. Rev. D **60**, 096006 (1999) [hep-ph/9906324].
- [37] S. J. Brodsky and H. J. Lu, Phys. Rev. D **51**, 3652-3668 (1995) [arXiv:hep-ph/9405218 [hep-ph]].
- [38] V. V. Kiselev, A. K. Likhoded, O. N. Pakhomova and V. A. Saleev, Phys. Rev. D **66**, 034030 (2002) [arXiv:hep-ph/0206140 [hep-ph]].
- [39] A. Deur, S. J. Brodsky and G. F. de Teramond, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. **90**, 1 (2016) [arXiv:1604.08082 [hep-ph]].

- [40] R. Hoque, B. J. Hazarika and D. K. Choudhury, Eur. Phys. J. C **80**, no.12, 1213 (2020)
- [41] S. Afonin and T. Solomko, J. Phys. G **49**, no.10, 105003 (2022) [arXiv:2208.02604 [hep-ph]].
- [42] G. Grunberg, Phys. Rev. D **29** (1984) 2315.
- [43] N. V. Krasnikov, Nucl. Phys. B **192** (1981) 497.
- [44] A. L. Kataev, N. V. Krasnikov and A. A. Pivovarov, Phys. Lett. B **107**, 115-118 (1981)
- [45] D. J. Gross and F. Wilczek, Phys. Rev. Lett. **30** (1973) 1343.
- [46] H. D. Politzer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **30** (1973) 1346.
- [47] P. M. Stevenson, Phys. Rev. D **23**, (1981) 2916.
- [48] A. L. Kataev and V. V. Starshenko, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **10** (1995) 235 [hep-ph/9502348].
- [49] D. R. T. Jones, Nucl. Phys. B **75** (1974) 531.
- [50] W. E. Caswell, Phys. Rev. Lett. **33** (1974) 244.
- [51] E. Egorian and O. V. Tarasov, Teor. Mat. Fiz. **41** (1979) 26 [Theor. Math. Phys. **41** (1979) 863].
- [52] O. V. Tarasov, A. A. Vladimirov and A. Y. Zharkov, Phys. Lett. B **93** (1980) 429.
- [53] S. A. Larin and J. A. M. Vermaseren, Phys. Lett. B **303** (1993) 334 [hep-ph/9302208].
- [54] T. van Ritbergen, J. A. M. Vermaseren and S. A. Larin, Phys. Lett. B **400** (1997) 379 [hep-ph/9701390].
- [55] M. Czakon, Nucl. Phys. B **710** (2005) 485 [hep-ph/0411261].
- [56] A. V. Smirnov, V. A. Smirnov and M. Steinhauser, Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 112002 (2010) [arXiv:0911.4742 [hep-ph]].
- [57] C. Anzai, Y. Kiyo and Y. Sumino, Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 112003 (2010) [arXiv:0911.4335 [hep-ph]].
- [58] H. R. P. Ferguson and D. H. Bailey, RNR Technical Report RNR-91-032.
<https://www.nas.nasa.gov/assets/pdf/techreports/1991/rnr-91-032.pdf>
- [59] D. H. Bailey and D. J. Broadhurst, Math. Comput. **70**, 1719 (2001) [math/9905048 [math-na]].
- [60] R. N. Lee, Nucl. Phys. B **830**, 474 (2010) [arXiv:0911.0252 [hep-ph]].
- [61] R. N. Lee and K. T. Mingulov, Comput. Phys. Commun. **203**, 255 (2016) [arXiv:1507.04256 [hep-ph]].
- [62] A. V. Nesterenko, Eur. Phys. J. C **77**, no.12, 844 (2017) [arXiv:1707.00668 [hep-ph]].

- [63] M. Davier, D. Díaz-Calderón, B. Malaescu, A. Pich, A. Rodríguez-Sánchez and Z. Zhang, [arXiv:2302.01359 [hep-ph]].
- [64] K. G. Chetyrkin, A. L. Kataev and F. V. Tkachov, Phys. Lett. **85B**, 277 (1979).
- [65] M. Dine and J. R. Sapiirstein, Phys. Rev. Lett. **43**, 668 (1979).
- [66] W. Celmaster and R. J. Gonsalves, Phys. Rev. Lett. **44**, 560 (1980).
- [67] S. G. Gorishnii, A. L. Kataev and S. A. Larin, Phys. Lett. B **259**, 144 (1991).
- [68] L. R. Surguladze and M. A. Samuel, Phys. Rev. Lett. **66**, 560 (1991) Erratum: [Phys. Rev. Lett. **66**, 2416 (1991)].
- [69] P. A. Baikov, K. G. Chetyrkin and J. H. Kuhn, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 012002 (2008) [arXiv:0801.1821 [hep-ph]].
- [70] P. A. Baikov, K. G. Chetyrkin, J. H. Kuhn and J. Rittinger, Phys. Lett. B **714**, 62 (2012) [arXiv:1206.1288 [hep-ph]].
- [71] R. L. Workman *et al.* [Particle Data Group], PTEP **2022**, 083C01 (2022)
- [72] J. Kodaira, S. Matsuda, T. Muta, K. Sasaki and T. Uematsu, Phys. Rev. D **20**, 627 (1979).
- [73] S. G. Gorishnii and S. A. Larin, Phys. Lett. B **172** (1986) 109.
- [74] S. A. Larin and J. A. M. Vermaseren, Phys. Lett. B **259** (1991) 345.
- [75] S. A. Larin, Phys. Lett. B **723**, 348 (2013) [arXiv:1303.4021 [hep-ph]].
- [76] P. A. Baikov, K. G. Chetyrkin and J. H. Kühn, Nucl. Part. Phys. Proc. **261-262**, 3 (2015) [arXiv:1501.06739 [hep-ph]].
- [77] M. Beneke, Phys. Rept. **317**, 1 (1999) [hep-ph/9807443].
- [78] V. I. Zakharov, Nucl. Phys. B **385**, 452-480 (1992)
- [79] K. G. Chetyrkin and A. Retey, hep-ph/0007088.
- [80] F. Jegerlehner and O. V. Tarasov, Phys. Lett. B **639**, 299-306 (2006) [arXiv:hep-ph/0510308 [hep-ph]].
- [81] G. 't Hooft, “Some observations in quantum chromodynamics,” Notes based on lectures given at Orbis Scientiae. January 17-21, 1977. University of Miami, Coral Gables, Floride (Reprint of February 1977).
- [82] G. 't Hooft, “Can We Make Sense Out of Quantum Chromodynamics?,” Lectures given at Int. School of Subnuclear Physics, Erice, Sisily. July 23 - August 10, 1977. PRINT-77-0723 (UTRECHT) Subnucl. Ser. **15** (1979) 943.
- [83] A. V. Garkusha and A. L. Kataev, Phys. Lett. B **705**, 400 (2011) [arXiv:1108.5909 [hep-ph]].

- [84] S. G. Gorishnii, A. L. Kataev, S. A. Larin and L. R. Surguladze, Phys. Lett. B **256** (1991) 81.
- [85] P. A. Baikov, K. G. Chetyrkin, J. H. Kuhn and J. Rittinger, JHEP **1207** (2012) 017 [arXiv:1206.1284 [hep-ph]].
- [86] F. Herzog, B. Ruijl, T. Ueda, J. A. M. Vermaseren and A. Vogt, JHEP **02**, 090 (2017) [arXiv:1701.01404 [hep-ph]].
- [87] T. Luthe, A. Maier, P. Marquard and Y. Schroder, JHEP **10**, 166 (2017) [arXiv:1709.07718 [hep-ph]].
- [88] A. L. Kataev, JHEP **02**, 092 (2014) [arXiv:1305.4605 [hep-th]].
- [89] J. Blumlein, D. J. Broadhurst and J. A. M. Vermaseren, Comput. Phys. Commun. **181**, 582 (2010) [arXiv:0907.2557 [math-ph]].
- [90] J. Blümlein, Clay Math. Proc. **12**, 167-188 (2010) [arXiv:0901.0837 [math-ph]].
- [91] C. Anzai and Y. Sumino, J. Math. Phys. **54**, 033514 (2013)
- [92] M. V. Kompaniets and E. Panzer, Phys. Rev. D **96**, no.3, 036016 (2017) [arXiv:1705.06483 [hep-th]].
- [93] C. Michael, Nucl. Phys. B **280**, 13 (1987).
- [94] H. J. Rothe, Phys. Lett. B **355**, 260 (1995) [hep-lat/9504012].
- [95] H. G. Dosch, O. Nachtmann and M. Rueter, hep-ph/9503386.
- [96] A. I. Shoshi, F. D. Steffen, H. G. Dosch and H. J. Pirner, Phys. Rev. D **68**, 074004 (2003) [hep-ph/0211287].
- [97] M. N. Chernodub, Universe **6**, no.11, 202 (2020) [arXiv:1003.3225 [hep-ph]].
- [98] S. L. Adler, J. C. Collins and A. Duncan, Phys. Rev. D **15**, 1712 (1977).
- [99] J. C. Collins, A. Duncan and S. D. Joglekar, Phys. Rev. D **16**, 438 (1977).
- [100] N. K. Nielsen, Nucl. Phys. B **120**, 212 (1977).